

The division of the empire -

TWO CATHOLIC COERCIVE STATES EMERGE

In the year of Augustine's appointment as bishop (395), Emperor Theodosius I had died in Milan.

Leading clerics had continued to harangue him against pagans, Jews, "heretics", even against external enemies of the empire; St. Ambrose and St. Augustine had praised him highly. And already in the 5th century, ecclesiastical circles gave the epithet "the Great" to the man who could shed blood like water.

After his death, the Roman Empire was divided between his two sons. The Western Roman Empire ended already in 476, the Eastern Roman Empire existed as the Byzantine Empire until 1453.

Ideally, however, the unity continued. Some laws appeared in the name of both rulers, and laws passed alone often had legal force here and there. But gradually an ever greater alienation developed.

Politically, each half of the empire led a special existence, and the competition that arose early on contributed to a mutual diminution of power. Culturally, too, the longer they lived, the more they differed. In the West, Greek was soon hardly spoken; in the East, Latin, although still the official language, was increasingly relegated to the background. Still under Theodosius' sons the conflicts begin, whereby Germanic tribes already play an essential role. In the East, the de facto rulers changed rapidly.

In the west, Stilicho, married to Serena, Theodosius' niece, led the affairs of state for more than a decade.⁴

Never again since this division has a single monarch united

The division of the empire

united the empire under itself. In Constantinople, the seventeen-year-old Arcadius (395-408) ruled over the East - still a vast territory: all of later Romania, Serbia, Bulgaria, Macedonia, Greece, furthermore Asia Minor with the Crimean peninsula, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, lower Libya, and the Pentapolis. In Milan, the eleven-year-old Honorius (395-423) commanded the even larger, richer, but politically not equally important West.

Both "child emperors," oppressed by the church and praised for their piety, continued their father's religious policy. If the latter alone had fought "heresy" - one of his main targets - with more than twenty decrees, his sons and their successors supported Catholicism with a wealth of further laws. They promoted it religiously, juridically, financially, they increased its property, they exempted the clergy from certain offices, some taxes, from military service. In short, the identification of the ruler with the cause of orthodoxy, which had already existed with Theodosius, now became virtually common "repertoire" (Anton).⁵

At the same time, this Catholic confessional state always terrorized more and more dissenters, even if there were still pagans even in top positions; five pagans, as far as we know, under Arcadius, fourteen under Honorius - no actual act of tolerance: one still needed the old believers who had long since proven themselves in high offices. Only during the 5th century, especially under Theodosius II, this changed.

For the time being, however, it was not so much the individual dissenter who was suppressed - even Arians were still leaders (four, as far as is known, under Arcadius, one under Honorius) - as the institution, and in general it was not so much a pro-Christian personnel policy as a very pro-Christian religious policy, in short a policy with "tolerance pour les person-nes, intolerance pour les idees" (Chastagnol). The "Roman Imperial Church", however, which came into being in the course of the 4th century, placed itself even more resolutely on the side of the state promoting it. It prayed for it, proclaimed that its violence was

iz Catholic child emperor from God, it secures him metaphysically, so to speak: the old trade of throne and altar.⁶

It is true that especially in the oldest Christianity the hatred of the world was widespread, the state was called "great whore" and "abomination of the earth" in the New Testament, the emperor was regarded

early as servant of the devil. But since Paul there was also a pro-state direction, consciously adapting and increasingly asserting itself; Irenaeus wrote: "Not the devil distributed the kingdoms of this world, but God"; Tertullian affirmed: "Christians are no one's enemies, least of all the emperor's"; after Constantine's recognition of Christianity church historian Bishop Euseb affirmed "what an affectionate reception the leaders of the individual churches enjoyed among all civil and military officials"; St. John Chrysostom knew that "God has not given us the kingdoms of this world, but God". St. John Chrysostom knew that God had first decreed "only one rule", "that of the man over the woman", but then also "other powers", namely "princes and authorities", whereby God wanted "one part to rule, the other to obey; that the rule be monarchical and not democratic", also that one had to face princes and subjects, rich and poor, in each case quite differently, to "accommodate" the one and not the other! In short, one had rushed to the rulers with flying colors. And only if they resisted the church, it was and still is valid: You shall obey God more than men ... "God," as must always be repeated, they were, they are - not theoretically, of course, but in praxi.⁷

In East and West, the Christian centers of government showed the same picture: incessant court cabals, power struggles, ministerial crises and murders. The Catholic "child emperors" - Arcadius, Honorius, then also Valentinian III and Theodosius II - were dependent, crowned zeros incapable of any decision, surrounded by greedy court henchmen, grand dignitaries, Germanic generals and, last but not least, eunuchs. Entrusted with the personal welfare of the majesties, the castrati constantly surround them; indeed, their chief, the palace chamberlain, though often bought on the slave market, frequently competes with the highly-

The division of the empire 13

est imperial officials and not infrequently even sets the tone politically among lesser potentates.

Occasionally, however, some *magister officiorum* acts as the actual imperial regent, in the west Olympius, in the east Helio, Nomus and Euphemius, the "great" politics is also in the hands of the *magistri militum*, the imperial field commanders fighting on all fronts, sometimes even against each other; partly Germanic, gradually indispensable in defending the borders: Stilicho in the west, Aspar in the east; partly Roman: Aetius, Boniface. Boniface falls against Aetius; Aetius, Aspar, Stilicho are murdered. Not to be underestimated - as so often in times of "decay": as if they did not all decay! - some women of the imperial house: in the east Pulcheria, Eudokia, Eudoxia, in the west Galla Placidia.⁸ Behind the women, however (but not only behind them and not only behind them) stood a scheming clergy, from whom high functionaries, fearing for their position, gladly sought support through new "heretic" decrees. Also the bishops intervened already in the 4th, even more in the 5th century. Above all, they understood how to extend the scope of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the *episcopalis audientia*, the *episcopal iudicium*, the "arbitration functions" of the chief shepherds, more and more, without, of course, being able to displace the state courts, especially since the episcopal courts were usually avoided and, telling enough, another court was preferred. In the Germanic countries, clerical arbitration did not become established at all. In principle, however, since Constantine I anyone could go to the bishop in a civil case, even if it is disputed whether the episcopal procedure was considered equivalent to the secular one. All this, however, disrupted the already neglected administration even more. A Christian coercive state emerged, which was finally destroyed in the West less by the invading "barbarians" than by itself, less consolidated by the Church than - certainly not the only reason for the debacle - continually undermined, ruined and finally inherited.⁹

Arcadius, Rufinus, Eutrop

Arcadius already in 383, as a child, Augustus, in 384 independent regent of the East, was educated first by his mother Aelia Flaccilla, a strict Catholic, then by the deacon Arsenius from Rome. Although not uneducated - even a pagan, Themistios, prefect of Constantinople, had taught him - the monarch

always depended on advisors, including his wife Aelia Eudoxia (mother of St. Pulcheria and Theodosius II), a staunch anti-German, who also drove Arcadius against Old Believers and "heretics", and in general largely directed his domestic policy. Already on August 7, 395, the seventeen-year-old emperor reprimanded the authorities' negligence in persecuting the cults of the gods.¹⁰

Most importantly, however, the young prince had fallen into the hands of the Gaul Flavius Rufinus, his guardian, upon the death of his father.

The Praefectus praetorio Orientis, not even mentioned by most church histories, is said to have advised Theodosius, the promoter of his career, to the bloodbath of Thessalonica, one of the most hideous massacres of antiquity, disgustingly glorified by Augustine (I 445 ff). Rufin of Aquitaine, brother of St. Silvia, was "a fanatical Christian" (Clauss). He broke off contact with the pagans Symmachus and Libanios. He built the Church of the Apostles at Chalcedon and enriched it with (alleged) relics of Peter and Paul from Rome. He founded, immediately adjacent, a monastery for Egyptian monks. He excelled in donations to the church as well as in his strident advocacy of "orthodoxy" against pagans and "heretics." The bishops fawned over him. No less a person than Ambrose, saint and Doctor of the Church, called him friend, but admitted how much they hated and feared Rufin.

First of all, he ousted his rival at court, the army commander and former consul Promotos, a pagan, by punitive

transfer to his unit, whereupon he was murdered.

Arcadius, Rufinus, Eutrop 15

Was, which was generally attributed to Rufin. 39z he saw to the overthrow of Praefectus praetorio Tatian, a highly educated pagan, and took his place himself. On December 6, 393, he had Tatian's son Proculus, city prefect of Constantinople, beheaded so quickly (in front of his father) that the emperor's pardon did not reach him. Tatian himself he deprived of his property and chased him into exile as a beggar. The murder of Lucian, probably in 395, a Christian and surprisingly right-thinking man whose goods Rufin had cashed in on, was also his work. After a complaint from an imperial relative, he had Lucian arrested in the middle of the night in Antioch, his official residence, and whipped to death with lead bullets before his eyes without any accusation. In every way the friend of the clergy enriched himself in rich and poor. He bartered away offices to the highest bidders, sold state slaves, favored denouncers, false accusations, showed himself bribable in trials and hoarded such immense treasures that Symmachus, at that time the most important representative of tradition-conscious Romanism, speaks of a "world robbery". In addition to his greed, which was also castigated by the poet Claudian, the ancient historians call Rufin arrogant, cruel, corrupt and cowardly. He is also said to have founded the enmity between Eastern and Western Rome. And finally, he sought to seize the entire empire through the intended marriage of his daughter to Arcadius."

But just when Rufin was hoping for co-regency, he himself lost his head. All plans, in fact, were thwarted by his bitterest enemy, the old eunuch and minister Eutrop, a Syrian bought on the slave market, castrated since early youth, de facto ruling the Eastern Empire, who was said to steer the obtuse emperor "like a piece of cattle" (Zosimus). Perhaps conspiring with Stilicho, in November 395, under the eyes of the ruler, Eutrop had Gothic troops on Constantinople's parade ground chop Rufin into a shapeless lump: mangle his face, tear out his eyes, dismember his body; then his head wandered around the city on a lance. Finally, Eutrop largely robbed Rufin himself to-

i6 Catholic Child Emperor's plundered fortune. In almost every other respect, too, he assumed his inheritance, through immense greed, lust for power, arbitrary banishments, confiscations, extortions, intrigues, without, of course, being generally cruel.¹²

. Gradually, however, Eutrop spoiled it with everyone, with the landlords, the strict Catholic empress and with the church, whose privileges he curtailed in favor of the state. He operated the restriction of

their right of asylum and of the episcopal jurisdiction. Appointed Patricius in 398, consul in 399 (as the first eunuch), he fell from grace in the same year. And none other than St. Chrysostom, to whom Eutrop owed the patriarchal chair (p. 138), now declared to the man who had fled to the cathedral, in a penny-pinching but famous sermon, that he had "wronged" the clergy. "You fight against the Church and plunge yourself into the abyss" – though the saint did not want to "revile" the eunuch, "mock" him, not "make fun of his misfortune". Shortly after, Arcadius, in a punitive edict, scolded the man he had just showered with honors, the "stain of the century," "a filthy monster." He banished Eutrop to Cyprus, and in 399, under the unjust charge of having usurped insignia of the emperor, he had him liquidated at Chalcedon. (The usual form of execution was beheading or strangulation.)¹³

The "hot summer" 400–

St. John Chrysostom and the Constantinople Goth Massacre.

Meanwhile, General Gainas, a Goth and Arian who had risen rapidly in the Roman army, had risen to the top. He had been involved in the war against Eugenius in 394, in Stilicho's campaign against Alaric in 395, in the assassination of Rufinus thereafter, and from 396 to 399, under Eutrop, so to speak, came *et magister utriusque militiae*. One day Gainas became the leader of the

The "hot summer" 400 17

anti-Germanic party, his greatest opponents, were delivered up, the consul Aurelian, the consular Saturnius, and the secret scribe John. The Goth, however, only touched them with his sword, apparently to suggest they deserved death, and then sent them into exile.¹⁴

However, after an ill-fated operation in 399 against a rebellious tribesman, the Goth Tribigild, Gainas fell into obscurity. Also, in Constantinople, in reaction to Gothic raids, pillaging, all manner of demagoguery, a rigorous national trend had developed, a pronounced anti-Germanism, "borne primarily by strict believing Christians" (Heinzberger). The people, incited by rumors, hated the Germans anyway, the "barbarians" and Arian "heretics", who even claimed their own church in the capital. Gainas therefore had a sharp dispute with Patriarch Chrysostomos, who eagerly sought to "convert" the Goths, also assigned Catholic Goths their own house of prayer, St. Paul's Church, and thus became "the founder of a <German> national church in Constantinople" (Catholic Baur).

Arian services, however, the bishop strictly forbade. He protested to the emperor against Gainas' demand for a church of his own. He railed against the Arians and other "heretics". He implored the ruler, ruled by Eudoxia, the fanatical Antigerman – Augusta since 400 –, not to tolerate throwing the sacred to the dogs. It was better to lose the throne than to betray the divine house – compare the so similar advice of his colleague Ambrose (1410 ff, 422 f, 429 f)! The episcopal intervention encouraged the citizens, with whom there had been conflicts before. They rebelled in the "hot summer" of the year 400, certainly partly due to the hatred of foreigners, the ethnic diversity. "The decisive factor, however, was the opposition of faith; the bloodbath broke out significantly when Gainas demanded the release of a church for his Arian Goths" (Aland).

The national party had armed the citizens and, along with the Roman garrison and palace guard, attacked the

¹⁸ Catholic Child Emperor Gothic minority. Gainas saved himself and some of his troops by storming a city gate on the night of July 12, 400. However, many of his soldiers were either massacred the same day, along with their wives and children, or burned to death along with the church in the "Gothic Church" where they had sought refuge: all in all, allegedly over 7000 people. It happened "at the instigation of the bishop Chrysostomos" (Ludwig), but perhaps even more so of the subsequent bishop Synesios. His omissions as an envoy are typical of antigermanism in Constantinople. In the process, St. Chrysostom's reputation was "strengthened in these turmoils"; admittedly not because he was "above the parties," as Catholic Stockmeier thinks, but because he was on the side of the victors. The Catholics,

shying away from open combat, removed the church roof and massacred the "barbarians" to the last man by hailing stones and burning beams. (34 years earlier, this procedure had already proved successful in Rome during the battle of two popes: P. 114.) After the battle, prayers of thanksgiving were sent to heaven, and Chrysostom, preaching, once again praised Him who directs all things manless.¹⁵ The fugitive Gainas, now officially an enemy of the state, made his way through Thrace to join his countrymen beyond the lower Danube. But after the destruction of his army while crossing the Hellespont, he was slain on December 23, 400, by the Hun chieftain Uldin, whom the government had bought, and his head was sent early the following year to Constantinople, where in the winter of 401/402 Aurelianus again served as praefectus praetorio Orientis.¹⁶

Headhunts, persecution of pagans and "heretics" ¹⁹

Headhunts, persecution of pagans and "heretics"

Christianity liked to look at the heads of fallen enemies; the rulers built themselves and the ruled on them. It was customary to send the heads of punished notables around the empire as trophies of victory. "Killing" is what Mark Twain calls the "chief ambition of the human race and the earliest event in its history – but only Christian culture has achieved a triumph of which it can be proud. In two or three centuries it will be recognized that the able head-hunters are all Christians . . ." ¹⁷

Already Constantine, the first Christian regent, had the severed head of the emperor Maxentius pelted with stones, covered with excrement and carried as far as Africa during the triumphal march through Rome after the Battle of the Milvian Bridge in 312 (I 223). The head of the usurper Iulius Nepotianus, who probably rebelled on behalf of Constantinople, was also led through Rome in 350, already on the 28th day of his reign. Three years later, the head of the usurper Magnentius (I 309 ff) could be admired in many provinces of the Empire. The heads of Procopius, a relative of Emperor Julian, in 366 (1349), of Magnus Maximus in 388, of Eugenius in 394 (1458) also served as Christian symbols of victory. On display in the late 4th or early 5th century were the heads of Rufin, Constantine III, Jovinus, Sebastianus, occasionally even the heads of relatives of disliked people.¹⁸

In addition to their anti-Gothic policies, the governments of both Arcadius and Honorius were characterized by persecution of pagans and "heretics," the corresponding measures even more severe than those of their father, whom, after all, pagan priests in regalia had greeted in Emona, then part of Italy, in 388.¹⁹

Already in the year of their accession to power, the new lords threaten backsliding Christians with a stricter application of the previous decrees, and officials who disobey them with the death penalty. In 396, all the privileges and revenues that temple priests still

zo Catholic child emperors had, annulled and pagan festivals forbidden. In 399

there is an order for the demolition of rural temples – the first law for their destruction. The ruined material disappears in the construction of roads, bridges, water pipes, walls. Urban adoration are left to the public. Works of art were protected, but bishops and monks rarely respected them. All altars had to be destroyed, statues of gods still existing had to be removed. Not only were they forbidden in cult, but even their installation in baths: by Arcadius in 399, by Honorius in 408 and 416, after a law for the final confiscation of all images of the gods had apparently been as ineffective as some earlier ones.²⁰

The decrees, issued in the name of both emperors, applied to both halves of the empire, but their enforcement in the west was milder and confined mainly to earlier decrees.²¹

Of course, both rulers fought heterodox Christians a fortiori, whether by reimposing old laws or enacting new ones.

At the turn of the 5th century, they threatened "heretics" with confiscation of property, expulsion, or exile. Even children who resisted conversion lost their possessions. Non-Catholic Christians had to give their churches to the "orthodox". They were not allowed to build new ones, to use private houses for

worship, to hold meetings and services, either publicly or secretly, or to appoint clergy. Heretics" were deprived of their civil legal capacity, forbidden to call themselves Christians, to make wills or to inherit on the basis of wills. And in 398, the death penalty was imposed on "heresy", initially reserved only for the Manichaeans, who were always the worst persecuted. But all these attempts at suppression and extermination were usually initiated by the "Great Church".²²

Honorius, Stilicho, Alarich 21

Honorius, Stilicho, Alarich

AND FIRST RAIDS OF GERMANIC CHRISTIANS

The Western Roman emperor Honorius (395–423), who was only eleven years old when his father died, was initially succeeded by Flavius Stilicho, a half-Wandal and imperial field commander (Magister militum), who was appointed by Theodosius on his deathbed.

The son of a Wandal officer who commanded an equestrian regiment under Valens, he was a Catholic, but his religious policy was subject to fluctuations. Thus he had the gold ornaments torn from the doors of the Capitoline temple of Jupiter, the ancient Sibylline books burned, after Augustine's interference, the "heretics", especially the Donatists, prosecuted by law and the privileges of the Church renewed. On the other hand, Stilicho allowed again the statue of Victoria (I 421 ff) or, for reasons of reason of state, favored individual pagans, favoring them, for example, for the city prefecture of Roms. There were still believers in the gods, to whom concessions were made in order to unite them with the Christian imperial house, which also needed the Senate as a counterweight to the authority of Constantinople. In this way, the ambition of prominent pagans was cleverly satisfied by the traditional office of a Roman city prefect, but at the same time they were kept away from politically decisive positions.²³

Since 384, Stilicho had been married to Theodosius's niece Serena, a faith-zealous, energetic woman who gained considerable prestige at the court of Honorius, whom she had mentored as a child. To the emperor, Stilicho married his daughter Maria in 398, and after her death in 408, her younger sister Thermantia, which increased his influence on the ruler, who was dependent on others for life.²⁴

Stilicho's time saw the onslaught of the Visigoths (1405 ff) on Italy, a Germanic tribe that succumbed to Christianity particularly early. After all, the Goths became the most important missionaries of the Germanic peoples. But most of the since the middle of the 4th century to the Danubian provinces, xz Catholic Child Emperors, especially in Pannonia and Mösia (where "bishoprics" existed even before that), soon ceased to be pagans and became Arians. According to church historian Socrates, the Goths, under the impression of their defeat by Constantine, that is, defeated by the sword, "first believed in the religion of Christianity". Again and again – 315, 323, 328 – they were warred against by this power-hungry despot and always defeated anew (1247 f), especially severely in 332, whereby their dead, many women apparently among them, children, were estimated at a hundred thousand. The most recent research also assumes that Constantine's successes in battle and the political ties of the Goths to the Roman Empire gave a "boost" to their Christianity. After all, ever since then Theodoret, the bishop, the church father's memorable dictum, has proved true: "The facts of history teach that war brings us greater benefit than peace."²⁵

After their destruction of Valens in 378 at Adrianople (1413 f), the Goths, reinforced by Huns and Alans, had swamped the Eastern Roman Empire. But then Alarich I, the founder of Visigothic kingship, allied himself with Emperor Theodosius, and in 394, at the Battle of Frigidus against Eugenius (I 456 ff), the strong contingent of Visigoths paid the highest blood toll, allegedly 10,000 dead, arousing suspicion that Theodosius had deliberately sacrificed them.

Immediately after Theodosius' death, Stilicho sent the dangerous comrades-in-arms back to the east. There, however, Arcadius now refused further payments to those settling in the Danube region, whereupon they invaded the empire under Alaric – "almost without exception Christians ... even

convinced Christians" (Aland); with an own church order already by the Homoean bishop Sigis-hari and probably also with monks. They overran the Balkans as well as, up to the southern tip, the almost defenseless Greece. According to Eunapios of Sardes (ca. 345-420), an admittedly inveterate Christian enemy, monks had also made Alaric's attack possible by treason at Thermopylae. Greece has never been more devastated: Macedo-

Honorius, Stilicho, Alaric 23

nia, Thessaly, Boeotia, Attica. Thebes was saved by its strong walls. Athens was horribly plundered (that Athena and Achilles protected it: a pagan tendency fairy tale). The rest of the country, its villas, temples, works of art, was horribly ravaged, Corinth burned to the ground. Boeotia is said to have been desolate for decades. In general, the Christian Goths completely devastated the cities, according to a repeatedly confirmed contemporary testimony, "by slaughtering the men throughout, but dragging away children and women in droves with them along with their belongings as booty" (Zosimus). This may be an exaggeration, but the catastrophe was terrible. It affected at the same time the paganism, but was used wisely by the ecclesiastical mission, St. Jerome might now also see "all Greece under the rule of the barbarians" and write: "The soul shudders at the sight of the ruins of our time".²⁶

Emperor Arcadius, however, appointed Alaric as *magister militum per Illyricum*, and Stilicho thereupon ceased fighting him. For five years the Gothic leader kept quiet. Then the "perfidia Graecorum", Byzantium conspiring with the "barbarians", fueled by the fear of Western Rome and Rufin's jealousy of Stilicho, protected itself for the first time by a method that was still to become a school: the diversion of Alaric into the Western Roman Empire.²⁷

Since the days of the Cimbrians and Teutons - wiped out by Marius at *Aquae Sextiae* and *Vercellae* (102/101 BC) except for small remnants - this was the first "barbarian" incursion into Italy.²⁸

Coming from the already badly fleeced Danubian lands, the Visigoths advanced into Italy in November 401. They used the passes of the Julian Alps, the *Birnbaum Forest* (northeast of Trieste), familiar to them from military campaigns under Theodosius. The timing was well chosen. Stilicho had withdrawn all available military from Italy to repel a Vandal invasion of *Rhaetia*, all borders had been exposed, the imperial court - Honorius was already preparing his escape to the west - on Stilicho's advice sought shelter in Milan, where he himself hurried with units from Gaul and Britain for relief. The

14 Catholic child emperors Goths, who in the meantime had conquered Veneto, failed because of the strong massing of troops in front of Milan. A battle of *Pollentia* (*Pollenzo*), started by Stilicho on April 6, 402, on Easter Sunday (on which his Arian opponents did not want to fight), with heavy losses and lasting into the night, remained undecided. But their camp, Alaric's family, all the spoils of war fell into Stilicho's hands, and a truce was concluded. At Verona, however, which the Goths attacked in the same or the following year, they were defeated by the imperial *generalissimo* after an encirclement. However, he did not destroy the troops, which had been weakened by famine, plague and desertion, but allowed them to escape over the Julian Alps after their unsuccessful attempt to break through to the *Brenner Pass*.²⁹

Claudius Claudianus, the last important poet of the Romans, sang of the slaughter before Verona in his time: 'When the (Roman) soldier leaves the battle line exhausted, he (Stilicho) uses the (barbarian) auxiliaries to repair the damage. By this cunning stratagem he weakens the savage riparians of the Danube by the force of blood kin and turns the battle to double gain for us, with barbarians falling on both sides' (*Et duplici lucro committens proelia vertit/In se barbariem nobis utrimque cadentem*).³⁰ The Romans' aversion to the "barbarians," the desire to eliminate Germanic tribes by Germanic tribes, by their own discord, which Tacitus already dreams of, becomes especially evident during the migration of peoples - what a trivializing vocabulary! - usually aggravated by the religious antagonism, as the

Catholics identified more and more with the Roman imperial ideal. For them, too, terms like "Rome" and "Roman" now reflected the God-given "order" of the world. And besides aristocratic circles, especially the church fathers, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Orosius, Prosper Tiro, sketch an often gruesome picture of "barbarian" brutality, not seldom pure "atrocious propaganda" (Diesner).³¹

According to Prudentius (348–after 405), the greatest early Catholic, most admired and read during the Middle Ages

Honorius, Stilicho, Alaric 25

Christian poet, Romans and "barbarians" differ like man and beast! Not to the pagan gods, he shouted Honorius, owed his victories, no, the Christian faith had steered the legions. Prudentius, who wants to glorify the church and himself finally "live completely for Christ" (Altaner/Stuiber), also praises that Christianity strengthens patriotism and militarism.³² (And in word and deed it does so until today!).

In the East the envoy Synesios (d. 413/414) agitated in the anti-Germanic sense. This landowner, who came from an old provincial aristocracy, incited the emperor to more activity – and later, unbaptized, rejecting Christianity, despite open criticism of its eschatology, became bishop of Ptolemais and metropolitan of the Pentapolis!

In 410 Synesios let himself be consecrated by Patriarch Theophilus of Alexandria (p. 136 ff) under the condition that he may keep his unchristian views also as bishop and continue his marriage – expressly he wished "many and well-born children". For God had given him the law, but the patriarch his wife. The inventor of a new weapon for the fight against the "barbarians" organized the war against the desert tribes, held flaming appeals and was thus no exception (cf. 1301 f). To a large extent, bishops were already organizing the effort against Germanic and Persian tribes. (An attack by the latter, for example, on a town in Thrace was repulsed by the local chief shepherd, who scored a direct hit on the enemy leader with a massive throwing machine fired by himself. True heroic miracles are also reported of a bishop in Toulouse who was in command during a siege).

Synesios, however, the infidel prelate, who probably fell fighting desert tribes, also sharply intervened against any emerging "heresy." He called for opposing Christians to be "cut off from us like an incurable limb, lest what is healthy also be corrupted by association with it. For defilement is transmitted, and he who is

2.6 Catholic child emperors

touches one who is unclean shares in the guilt Therefore the Church of Ptolemais decrees the following to her sisters everywhere on earth" – and now comes the earliest example of a bull of excommunication against Christians who have become disliked: "Every sacred space and district is to be closed to them. The devil has no share in paradise; if he has slipped in secretly, he will be expelled. I exhort, therefore, every citizen and official not to share with him the same roof and the same table, in particular the priests not to welcome them as living and not to escort them as dead..."

The devil, that is for the heralds of the Good News, of love of neighbor and enemy: the Christian of other faith!

The unbelieving prince of the Church Synesios preached sermons "of unimpeachable dogmatic correctness"! And how many of his kind there may have been, there are! Does it bother the church? The disputes with it "always begin where the theologians want to take their profession quite seriously and make the peculiarities of the Christian faith binding for themselves and their church" (v.

Campanhausen).^{3*}

Honorius at that time, on his victory chariot Stilicho beside him, hurried over the Milvian Bridge to Rome, with the glorious spolia of victory in the escort of Christ, as Prudentius sings. A Christian Teuton had fought against Christian Teutons and saved Italy once again from the Teutons.

The invasion of Radagais, Stilicho's murder 27

The Invasion of Radagais, Stilicho's Murder, and Further Roman Catholic Gothic Massacres

In late 405, a new massive band of Germanic tribes, mostly composed of pagan Ostrogoths, set out from Pannonia under the wandering king Radagais and invaded Italy in early 406 – 200,000 people according to Orosius, and as many as 400,000 according to Zosimus, which is pure nonsense. After all, the whole of Italy was in a panic. The Goth besieged Florence, but had to give way before Stilicho into the mountainous country of Faesulae (Fiesole). There Stilicho, a routine perimeter strategist, surrounded him "by divine providence" (Orosius) and starved his troops – according to Augustine, who attributes this to the "mercy of God", "well over 100,000 men without a single Roman being killed, or even wounded"! Radagais was apprehended on August 23, 406, while trying to sneak through Roman lines, and was beheaded soon after. His people surrendered. The captives migrated into slavery in such numbers that they depressed market prices. Piece by piece they were knocked loose for an aureus. God helped, Augustine exults, "wonderfully and mercifully."

Stilicho, the savior of Italy, was then given a statue in the Forum with the inscription: "To His Excellency (inlustrissimo viro) Flavius Stilicho, twice ordinary consul, master of both arms, commander of the guard, chief equerry, and raised from youth through the steps of a brilliant military career to princely kinship, companion of the immortalized Emperor Theodosius in all campaigns of war and in all victories, also related to him by marriage, likewise also father-in-law of our Lord the Emperor Honorius, the Roman people, because of his unique popularity and his care, decided to erect a statue of brass and silver near the tribune in memory of his imperishable fame ...". ..

However, at the end of 406, the Vandals, Alans, Suebi in Gal-

18 Catholic child emperors' line and conquered it. And around the same time – so often deplored as mala tempora – usurpation after usurpation took place.

First, at the end of 406, the usurper Marcus rose in Britain and was slain shortly thereafter, in 407. Four months later, his successor Gratianus perished. That same year, Britannian troops under Flavius Claudius Constantine III (407–411) revolted. He had become emperor as a common soldier; was also a Christian, as, incidentally, were most usurpers since Constantine I, as evidenced by literary sources or coinage. Constantine III crossed into Gaul with an army and eventually sent his son Constans – a monk before he became Caesar – to Spain, where he defeated an army among relatives of Honorius and Constantine had two of the commanders, Didymus and Verianus, executed. The other leaders of the defeated fled to Italy, where Constantine also went after his father had made him Augustus. But now his own Magister militum Gerontius, threatened with deposition, rebelled against Constantine III.

Gerontius appointed his son Maximus emperor against Constans, defeated Constans, pursued him to Gaul, where he ordered him to be beheaded in Vienne at the beginning of 411, before he himself was forced to commit suicide in Spain. Constantine III, however, was defeated by Honorius' army commander, had himself ordained a priest and surrendered in Arles, his residence town, in exchange for assurance of life, whereupon the Catholic emperor had him beheaded along with his younger son Julianus at the Mincio in August 411. Decimus Rusticus and Agroetius, two high officials of Constantine III and the Gallic emperor Jovinus, were also cruelly killed with their leading followers at Clermont. – Meanwhile, however, we are ahead of developments by a few years, Alaric was threatening a new invasion of Italy. Stilicho got into trouble. He advised to give in. The Catholics, however, opposed. They hated the descendant of a Vandal and a Roman provincial, hated a man who, in spite of all the "heresy" combating, had built the temple of the Roman Empire.

The invasion of Radagais, Stilicho's murder 29

destruction, had even had the statue of Victoria reinstalled in the Senate chamber, albeit not as a cult image but as an ornament.³⁵

In general, anti-Germanism from the East now penetrated more and more into the West.

The church teacher Jerome attacked Stilicho's policy during the "barbarian" assault on Italy. He saw in the Germanic peoples signs of the Antichrist or even the Antichrist himself. In the middle of a letter to the young widow Geruchia (oh, how many young women the saint wrote to, and how insinuatingly he sometimes wrote!), whom he was trying to talk out of a new marriage, in the middle of the letter he interrupted himself and turned to world history: "But what do I do? While the ship is sinking, I talk about the ship's cargo. He who stopped the destruction is taken out of the way, and still we do not understand that the Antichrist is coming.... Countless wild nations have poured over the whole of Gaul. The whole territory between the Alps and the Pyrenees, between the Ocean and the Rhine, has been devastated by Quades and Vandals, Sarmatians and Alans, Gepids and Heruls, Saxons, Burgundians, Alemanni and - unhappy Empire - by our Pannonian enemies, because Assur comes with them. Mainz, once a famous city, has been conquered and destroyed by them, several thousand people have been cut down in the church. Worms has also fallen after a long siege. The fortified city of Rheims, furthermore Amiens, Arras, the coastal area of the Morins, Tournay, Speier and Strasbourg, all this is now in the possession of the Teutons. Aquitaine, the land of Neunga, the territory around Lyon ..." Jerome finds no end to his eloquence. The tears come and dry up on him. "Who should think all this possible? What work of history will report it in worthy language? That Rome struggles within her borders, not for the increase of her glory, but for her existence! Nay, not even fights, but buys her life with gold and all her possessions! It is not to our God-fearing emperors that we can attribute the blame for our misery.

We owe it to the

jo Catholic Child Emperor

nefariousness of a half-barbarian traitor, who out of our means supplied arms to our enemies. "36

No, according to Jerome, it was not the pious Catholic regents who were to blame, but Stilicho, whom the inscription on his statue in the Roman Forum immortalized as a participant in all the emperor's wars and victories. (A semi-barbarian traitor had led the enemies against the empire with Roman money.

However, the Roman pagans, all anti-Germanic opponents of Stilicho "from the civil administration and the Catholic Church" (Eibern), believed something similar. Always again they suspected him of striving for the crown for his son Eucherius, either the rule over the eastern empire or that in the west, where Honorius was supposed to give way to him. Furthermore, it was claimed that Eucherius, presumably a Christian, was planning to persecute Christians. Of course, Stilicho himself was also accused of greed for power, of plans to usurp the throne, even spreading the rumor that he had already had coins minted for himself and that his wife Serena had prevented a pregnancy of her daughters, the emperor's wives, in order to support her husband's usurpatory intentions. But there could hardly be any doubt about his loyalty to the regent, who now repudiated Stilicho's daughter Thermantia, even if he, together with Alaric, who had already hurried ahead to Epirus, had wanted to march against Ostrom, with whom the dispute had not ended since the days of Rufinus.

Most of all, however, the Catholic Olympius, the head of the party hostile to Stilicho in Italy, incited the ruler against him. And when Honorius on 13. August 408 in Ticinum (Pavia), Olympius, a Catholic zealot of "the strictest observance" (Clauss), who owed much to Stilicho, had his friends in the imperial entourage cut down: Praefectus praetorio of Gaul, Limesius; Magister militum per Gallias, Chariobaudes; Magister equitum, Vincentius; former Praefectus praetorio of Italy, Longinianus; Comes domesticorum, Salvius; Magister officiorum, Naemorius, whom Olympius succeeded. The Quaestor sacri

The invasion of Radagais, Stilicho's assassination 31

palatii was killed while embracing the emperor's knees. In the city, the soldiers murdered all the officials they could lay their hands on.³⁷

After eliminating Stilicho's partisans, assaulting and cutting down his loyal Hunnic bodyguard while he slept, he was deposed and sought the asylum of a Ravenna church under cover of night on August 21. Ravenna, because of its sheltered position on a promontory between the Adriatic Sea and the lagoons, had been the new main western residence since 400, instead of Milan, which lay open on the plain. Treason and assassination were rampant here. On the morning of August 22, 408, soldiers lured Stilicho out of the church. They had sworn to him, in the presence of the bishop, that the emperor – Stilicho's son-in-law – had not ordered them to murder him, but to guard him. A letter from the Catholic majesty also guaranteed his safety. But no sooner had Stilicho left the church than a second imperial letter opened his death sentence for high treason; the next day his head fell.

Olympius, however, after the bloodbath of Ticinum, which he had instigated, advanced to the title of *Magister officiorum* (a title that modern historians render with "Oberhofmarschall", "Reichshofmeister", "Vorstand des gesamten Hofstaats", "Innenminister", "Minister of Foreign Affairs", "ministre de la police generale") in August. It was an office that was at the top among the four high court offices since the second half of the 4th century, that assigned to its holder, among many others, also (mainly) the ecclesiastical-political affairs and (entirely) the "agentes in rebus", a disreputable, detested organization that conveyed imperial letters and orders, performed informer and espionage services, occasionally also carried out "special orders", such as the liquidation of high-ranking personalities.

Olympius, then, became the leading man. He had tortured and beaten to death Stilicho's friends, had robbed others of their property. On his initiative, with effect from November 14, 408, enemies of the Catholic Church were closed down.

32. catholic child emperors

Church ("catholicae sectae") from court dignities and forbade them to serve in the palace. It is disputed whether the exclusion applied "only" to "heretics" or also to believers in the gods, as is likely. This was followed by new punitive measures against the Donatists on November 24, 408, and January 15, 409. Further laws threatened apostate Catholics and strengthened the power of the bishops. The anti-Germanic party gained the upper hand with Olympius. Throughout the Western Empire, Stilicho's followers and all Germanic tribes were hunted down. His only son with Serena, Eucherius (in 400 still betrothed to the emperor's sister Galla Placidia), managed to escape, but was taken from a church north of Rome and killed by Honorius' eunuchs. But while they, writes Ferdinand Gregorovius, displayed the bloody head to the Romans, "the latter themselves already suspected their own fate." (Augustine's disciple Orosius imputes plans for a pagan restoration to Stilicho's son). Likewise, Stilicho's widow Serena, the niece of Emperor Theodosius, died in Rome by order of the Senate; they strangled her. Also the husband of Stilicho's sister, the Comes Africae Bathaniarius, was murdered and his office was transferred to Heraclianus, who admittedly was still killed himself (p. 42). At the same time, in the cities of the country, Italian troops massacred numerous women and children of Germanic mercenaries. And finally, the state confiscated the property of all those who owed Stilicho an office.³⁸

To be sure, clannishness was not a given among the Christian rulers so fondly celebrated as "mild." But very often the sons of the condemned shared the fate of their fathers. Sometimes other family members also fell, as in the case of the apparently particularly hated Stilicho. And not infrequently, cruel revenge was also taken on the followers of the liquidated opponents.

After the Battle of the Milvian Bridge, when a speaker celebrated Constantine's "benevolent victory" and his "clemency," the entire house of Emperor Maxentius was wiped out and his leading partisans were also hunted down. Similar things happened after the defeat of Licinius, who in turn, under the The invasion of Radagais, Stilicho's assassination 33

cheers of the church fathers, ordered the imperial families to be slaughtered (I 223, 229 f, 232). In the

massacre of relatives after Constantine's death, the very Christian Constantius II, the "bishop of bishops," had most of the male relatives of the imperial house, his two uncles, six cousins, and numerous inconvenient persons of the court killed (I 306 f). Even after the suicide of Magnentius, the first Germanic counter-emperor, in Lyon in 353, many heads of Constantius' enemies rolled. Likewise, two years later, when eliminating the Frank Silvanus, whom bribed soldiers slew, he had his officials killed. In 366, during the liquidation of the usurper Prokop, who was beheaded by his own officers, and of Marcellus, who was torturously mauled, their relatives were also executed (I 349). Less than a decade later, the followers of the counter-emperor Firmus were massacred in Africa in an unusually gruesome manner by the army commander Theodosius, the father of the future emperor. When in 376 in Carthage, the master himself, victim of a court intrigue, was beheaded, several of his friends shared his fate. And also in the fiasco of the Berber prince Gildo – a brother of Firmus – who was strangled at the end of July 398, a part of his officials ended by the executioner or killed themselves; the Donatist bishop Optatus of Thamugadi, who was allied with him, died in the dungeon (I 344, 473)–39.

The wives of the fallen were usually spared. But there were exceptions. For example, the wife of Magister peditum Barbatio was executed at Sirmium (near Belgrade) in 359 after his conspiracy was uncovered, along with the army commander. As a rule, the wives and family members affected in this way fell into poverty. A law of Arcadius of 397 pardoned the sons of high traitors, but denied them their inheritance and excluded them from state service; daughters received a quarter of their mother's inheritance.⁴⁰

But one was the paper, the other the reality. Thus, in Stilicho's fall, not only his son, his brother-in-law, but also his wife were implicated.

34 Catholic child emperors

Behind the weak Honorius stood the national-Roman and Catholic court clique of Ravenna, Christians of the strictest mind, especially, as the head of the conspiracy, the Asian and Magister officiorum Olympius, from whose prayers Emperor Honorius expected much. Olympius, first a favorite, then an opponent of Stilicho, had gained an important court office from the emperor through Stilicho, but in the end he had raged most fiercely against Stilicho and brutally persecuted his followers even after his death. St. Augustine, of course, held the pious upstart in such high esteem that he congratulated him twice, once on the mere rumor, then after the official announcement. The promotion, Augustin wrote, was "on merit." Immediately afterwards, he exhorted Olympius to get serious with the execution of the anti-pagan laws. It is time to show the enemies of the Church what these laws mean! Augustine's attitude proves how the Christians just now expected from Olympius the final realization of those measures against pagans and "heretics" which Stilicho, following Christian pressure, still initiated himself by decrees of February 22 and November 15, 407 – "a kind of general reckoning with the opponents of the Catholic faith and in the political field with those of the Christian state"

(Heinzberger). On the Catholic side, it was believed that the defeat of the "barbarians" required the destruction of paganism.⁴¹

The Fall of Rome (410) and Augustine's Evasion

Outraged by the Roman Catholic massacres, the Germanic soldiers, reportedly 30,000 strong, went over to Alaric. They fled Italy to the political sphere of influence of the Gothic king, who had vainly awaited Stilicho's force in Epirus. Also the Western Roman pay failed to materialize. Thus Alaric advanced to Italy via Pannonia. On the way he demanded 4000 pounds of gold for his march through messengers to Stilicho.

The Fall of Rome (410) and Augustine's Evasion 35

to Epirus; a very considerable sum, which the Senate reluctantly decided to pay after an intervention by Stilicho, but then, as a result of the upheaval in the Western Roman government, did not pay. Alaric,

meanwhile invaded Italy through the unprotected Julian Alps, crossed the Po at Cremona, devastated the country far and wide, and in 408 appeared before Rome, which he enclosed; famine and plague broke out in it. Against the promise of a huge tribute (allegedly 5000 pounds of gold, to which liquefied images of gods also contributed, 30 000 pounds of silver, 4000 silk robes, 3000 purple-dyed skins, 3000 pounds of pepper) he moved to Tuscia, after his army had increased 40 000 slaves escaped from the city. Olympius, however, tried to undermine Alaric's demands. The *magister officiorum* therefore lost his office in January 409, and although he returned to it, after a success against the Goths at Pisa, he was again and definitively fired by Honorius that very spring. He fled to Dalmatia, where in 411/412 the *magister militum* Constantius had him seized, robbed of his ears and beaten to death with knuckles. Alaric had marched to Rome for the second time in 409 after negotiations had failed again. And this time he created a compliant prince for himself. He imposed on the Romans their city prefect Priscus Attalus, who was about sixty years old and had to be baptized in Alaric's camp by the Goth bishop Sigisarius, as counter-emperor. The newly minted Christian and emperor (409-410) sent a small contingent of troops to Africa to secure Rome's grain supply and himself moved against Ravenna to force Honorius to abdicate. There, *Praefectus praetorio* Jovius, the ruler's negotiator and the most important man at court, went over to Attalus and suggested that Honorius still be mutilated. But 4000 soldiers approaching from Constantinople saved him. And Alaric dethroned Attalus again because he refused to let Africa be conquered by Goths, whose settlement he feared. The king now tried again, and again in vain, to reach an understanding with Honorius.

)6 Catholic child emperors, whereupon he advanced on Rome a third time. And now, on August 24, 410, after hunger had already driven the citizens to cannibalism, the city fell. Through the *Porta Salaria*, which is said to have been opened from the inside, the Visigoths entered, drunk with victory, while a stream of refugees poured across southern Italy to Africa and Palestine.⁴²

Rome, still one of the richest cities in the world, was thoroughly robbed for three days, but probably not very devastated, indeed, hardly touching its matrons and maidens. After all, Gibbon blasphemes, lack of youth, beauty, and virtue kept most of them from being raped. Of course, atrocities did occur. Thus, "zealous Arians" or "idolaters" blew up women's convents in order to forcibly free the nuns from the "vow of virginity" (Gregorovius). Christian voices even claim that part of the city was burned down. But be that as it may, nothing disturbed a man of Augustine's stature. For, he notes, what was committed in the "Roman catastrophe in devastation, murder, robbery, fire and other misdeeds, must be laid to the charge of the custom of war. But the novelty that took place, the unexpected fact that barbaric cruelty turned out to be so mild that spacious churches were chosen as gathering places and refuges for the people, where no one was killed, from where no one was dragged away..., this is to be attributed to the name of Christ and the Christian age.... No, their bloodthirsty and cruel mind one, only one has shrunk back", and now of all things the one "who so long before spoke through the prophet: "I will punish their sin with the rod and their iniquities with plagues. But I will not turn away my mercy from them"".

Indeed, by express order of Alaric, churches and church property were spared, as were St. Peter's and St. Paul's, which lay outside the walls, during the destruction of 408 and 409. In Rome, where ignorance was not accidentally rampant, it was believed that the city and its monuments had been destroyed by the Goths until deep into modern times. In fact, however, those had,

The fall of Rome (410) and Augustine's evasions 37

far more than the "barbarians," ruined decay, Christians of the Middle Ages, indeed, some popes.⁴³ For 800 years Rome had not been conquered—the city where, it was believed, Peter and Paul rested along with uncounted martyrs. And now it fell in Christian times! The pagans saw the reason for it in the contempt of the gods. "Behold," they said, "in Christian times Rome has fallen." "As long as we

offered sacrifices to our gods, Rome stood, Rome flourished ..." In addition, just before the fall of the city, the government had legally inculcated the exclusive validity of Christianity on November 14, 408. There was almost a ferment among the Old Believers as before, when they shouted "Christianos ad leones" at the onset of all sorts of calamities.⁴⁴

The world was shaken, frozen; especially the Catholic world. Ambrose, who had already felt the general downfall after Adrianople (1413 f), was no longer alive. But now his colleague Jerome, far away in Bethlehem and commenting on the prophet Ezekiel, saw the end looming, the fall into eternal night, he saw the fall of Troy and Jerusalem before him: the world is going down, *orbis terrarum ruit*.⁴⁵

"If Rome can perish, what can be certain?" Why did heaven allow this to happen? Why did Christ not protect Rome? "Where is God?" (*Ubi est deus tuus?*) Augustine ventilated the earth-shattering question in several homilies in 410 and 411 (the first delivered just three days after the Goths withdrew from Rome); his wisdom ranging from "Quia voluit Deus" to "Deo gratias." Whereby he claims that the existence of the earthly state is only of secondary importance – and today, after all, the preservation even of the whole world does not care about the atomic bomb theologians: even theology progresses!

Augustin did not notice any catastrophe at all: only God, the dear, just, a strict father admittedly, he "punishes every son whom he accepts (Hebr. 12,6)". And although the bishop cries out: "massacres, fires, plundering, human murder and torture," he consoles in the familiar parochial manner (cf. I 480 ff, 522 ff): compared to the torments of hell, this visitation is

38 Catholic child emperors not so bad! Also, many had been saved, but the dead had gone into eternal peace! Thus, one should actually rejoice, should thank God that he had not completely destroyed Rome: "manet civitas, quae nos carnaliter genuit. Deo gratias!"⁴⁶

Priests are unashamed, never embarrassed (cf. I 514 ff).

Moreover, Augustin takes up the question, the scornful reproach of the pagans, "Where is now your God?", the mockery of those who themselves should first see "where their gods are", in the no less than "22 books on the divine state", his "opus ingens", his, according to himself, exceedingly great work, losing sight of the occasion, however, more and more through historical-theological fantasies about the *civitas dei* and *civitas terrena*.⁴⁷

With what rhetorical effort does the Saint defend God in the face of Rome's fall! It did not matter, knew "the philosopher of the *Orbis universus christianus*" (Bernhart), who here becomes the "first universal historian and historical theologian of the Occident" (v. Campenhausen), what people thought about the destruction, how many Christians were tortured, killed, abducted, how many died by their own hand, how many starved to death, how many women were violated, how often "barbarian lust took hold". No, no. Oh, even the rape had its good! For would so many not otherwise have exalted themselves because of their chastity, would not "vain pride" once have seen the "light of day"? Yes, "so their integrity was snatched from them by force, so that happy preservation did not pervert their modesty". Yes, so "the philosopher of the *Orbis universus christianus*", the "spiritual giant", the "genius in all fields ..." (1464 ff), whom all this could not shake, because God wanted it! And what did God want with it? Glittering through many biblical quotations, bored through, Augustin reports that God did not destroy Rome, that he merely "willingly tested and purified" the citizens, his "whole household", that he chastised them, purified them, awakened their repentance and so appeased his own wrath, restored to the Romans their "right to live" and their "right to live".

The fall of Rome (410) and Augustine's excuses 39

The Romans were to be given the gift of his benevolence again – higher, very highest educational purposes. The human race needed discipline. "They will not perish if they praise God, they will perish if they blaspheme Him". "Exalted is the providence of the Creator and Controller of the world, "incomprehensible are His judgments and inscrutable His ways>".

For this, the ways of his servants are all the easier to comprehend – are priests unashamed, never embarrassed.

With Alaric, the conqueror of Rome – whom Augustine's complete work mentions only in two places (once with concealment of the actual name) – the conquest had basically little or nothing to do, but with the just and merciful providence

of God, whose instruction is always the best, whose riddles will be cleared up on the last day, who still showed himself merciful during the destruction, softened hardships, because he did not want the downfall of the Romans, but their conversion and their new life! "In short, as a hand lashes out to strike, but pauses out of pity, because the punished one has already sunk down before, so it happened to that city.... God undoubtedly also spared the city of Rome, since large parts of the population had migrated before the burning by the enemies. The refugees had migrated, the deceased had migrated ... By the hand of the improving God, therefore, the city was set right rather than destroyed." 48

Philosopher of the *Orbis universus christianus*!

Presbyter Orosius, who undertook to prove the far more beautiful conditions of the world in Christian times (I 509 ff), also finds the matter, like the master, actually quite satisfying. But it does not speak against the Christians at all. Orosius is able to compare the Alaric invasion of Rome, the center of his entire *Histories*, with a much longer and worse one from pagan times, the Gaulish invasion under Brennus, the prince of the Senones. Then (387 B.C.) six months of "miseriae," bloody sacking of the city, now almost the purest honey-licking, at least a *miraculum*: three

40 Catholic child emperors

days of occupation only, supposedly hardly any deaths, although the streets lay full of corpses, charred ruins continued to rise into the sky for years, houses, palaces were ruthlessly looted, and refugees all over the world once again proclaimed their demise. But to the very Christians who sought help in the churches, protection, Alaric, his first command, granted sparing: one more proof of the mildness of the *tempora Christiana*, the time of grace.⁴

But the bishop of Rome, Innocent I (401–417), behaved characteristically at the time. In 408, when the city was first threatened, he tolerated, at least according to the Old Believer historian Zosimus, pagan sacrifice in private houses to appease the wrath of the gods. Allegedly, he also gave his consent to the city prefect Pompeianus to consult the "haruspices", the visceral showers, which Zosimus, certainly neither the most reliable nor the most astute historian of his time, praises as a proof of patriotism that "placed the salvation of the city higher than its own faith". And at the capture itself, the high lord was conspicuous by his absence; after all, other shepherds had also left their flocks in time. Augustine's disciple Orosius reports that the Holy Father "removed from Sodom like a righteous loth, by God's inscrutable counsel stayed at Ravenna at that time and did not see the downfall of the sinful people." In fact, he had entrusted the protection of his basilica to the Prince of the Apostles and had himself been sitting in the marshy, almost impregnable city since the year before, as a member of a Senate commission – either on business or for his own safety. In any case, he was not disturbed by Rome's plundering. It is true that he would have liked, Jesuit Grisar knows (from where, I wonder?), to stay "in the midst of the afflicted", "to help and comfort them". In fact, however, Innocent speaks of it only once in his numerous letters, in extreme coldness and brevity, in a subordinate clause.⁵⁰

It was the greatest, the most shattering catastrophe of the time. The pope, however, did not bat an eye.

Orosius apparently seeks to clear him, presumably vis-à-vis derogatory refugee-.

The Fall of Rome (410) and Augustine's Evasions 41

ling speeches. Jerome praises the predecessor Anastasius I. Only briefly, he thinks, was Rome allowed to keep him, because the head of the world should not sink into the dust under such a bishop. Innocent I, however, he passes over with meaningful silence. Pope historian Caspar sees in this "a sharp criticism"

and claims that Innocent was "in his innermost being untouched" by the fall of the Roman Empire. If one immerses oneself in his letters as the primary and almost only documents on the history of his pontificate, one feels "carried away from that world in which thrones burst and empires splintered, into the patriarchal air of a world of __ thoughts directed solely to papal claim protection and universal administration." ⁵¹

Hardly any Christian chronicler of the epoch defended the Ravenna intermezzo of the Roman. No wreath of legends entwined itself around him, as later around Leo I, when he confronted Attila (p. 274 ff). And this must have its reasons.

Emperor Honorius is said to have been completely occupied with chicken breeding during the plundering. But the victors departed after three days, with immense booty and many 'prisoners - among them, politically most valuable treasure, the monarch's sister, Galla Placidia, daughter of Theodosius I, a twenty-one year old girl and soon one of the most influential women of that time, whom we still sometimes meet.

The Goths passed through Campania, where they besieged Nola, sacked and captured the bishop, "voluntarily quite poor, but all the richer in holiness" (Augustine). They aimed for Calabria, Sicily, Africa, the granary of Italy. But a storm in the Strait of Messina engulfed their fleet. On the way back, Alaric died unexpectedly at Cosenza on the Busento, where he was buried. For another year, the Christian raiders under his brother-in-law Athaulf (410-415) scoured Italy, "grazing like locusts what remained of the first" (Jordanes). Then they turned westward. At Narbonne in 414, Athaulf married Galla Placidia, the onetime fiancée of the murdered Stilicho's son, and founded the southern French-Spanish Visigothic empire with its northern

4i Catholic child emperors

capital Toulouse, before he himself, just a year later, was forced to withdraw across the Pyrenees and assassinated in Barcelona.⁵²

Honorius' fight against "heretics," pagans, and Jews.

A few years after Stilicho's elimination, that of his family, officers, soldiers, Honorius had also cruelly executed Stilicho's successor and beneficiary Olympius as a fugitive in Dalmatia; likewise, we recall, on the Mincio, the usurper Constantine III, whom Britain and Gaul recognized and, temporarily, the emperor himself; on oath he had promised him sparing. Also liquidated was Constantine's younger son Julianus, and - together with several of his followers - the Comes Africae Heraclianus, who had once led Stilicho's arrest and beheading, had even killed him with his own hand, but then in 413, in his year of consulship, attacked Italy with a huge fleet of allegedly 3700 ships; further the magister militum Allobich in Ravenna, August 410; likewise (by the Visigoth Athaulf) the Gallic usurper Sebastianus; ditto his brother Jovinus, who extended his rule also to Britain, before the Praefectus praetorio Dardanus finished him off single-handed in Narbonne in the spring of 413. The heads of both were sent to Constantinople, as already the head of Constantine III (p. 28). Also his earlier opponent Maximus still jumped over the blade, after one had performed him in 422 on the occasion of the Tricennial of Honorius in triumph. And Attalus, who had fled with the Visigoths to southern Gaul and was again made emperor by Athaulf in 414, was finally captured at sea, moderately mutilated in the hand, and banished to the Lipari Islands.⁵³

The young emperor Honorius, however, was pious and particularly amenable to clerical whispers. He lived "the two

Honorius' struggle against "heretics," pagans and Jews 43

ideas to which he owed his accession: hereditary legitimacy and unbreakable adherence to the Christian Church" (Ranke). He increased their protection even more and rights, yes, finally gave the prelates almost unlimited influence on the execution of the laws. And especially his religious edicts - in contrast

to those of Emperor Valentinian I or Gratian – are no longer attempts to define "heresy" and "orthodoxy", but powerful supports of orthodoxy, an outright identification with its goals, "pure implementing regulations for its enforcement" (Anton). The monarch now claimed not only the right to punish dissenters but also to change their faith.⁵⁴

As early as March 23, 395, he confirms all the privileges granted to the clergy by his predecessors. He orders the so-called mathematicians to burn their books before the eyes of the bishops and to join the Catholic Church. Those who resist are to be expelled, and those who are particularly stubborn are to be banished.⁵⁵

Olympius had probably already initiated an imperial decree that called the "Catholic faith" the only permissible one. The decree of February 12, 405, threatens the Donatists; that of February 22, 407, Priscillianists and Manichaeans, an edict that may have inspired or influenced Pope Innocent I. It identifies "heretical" behavior with a "public crime" (*crimen publicum*) and the "common good" (*sa-lus communis*) with the "benefit of the Catholic Church" – *mutatis mutandis* the principle on which the persecution of Christians by pagan rulers was already based. On November 15, 407, the destruction of all pagan altars and cult images was decreed, as well as the confiscation of temples not yet confiscated, together with their goods and revenues. On November 14, 408, shortly after Stilicho's assassination, all non-Catholics, all "enemies of the Catholic religion" (*catholica secta*), are excluded from court service and the harshest regulations are issued against the Donatists. At the same time, a law deprived the temples of all revenues, in order to give them especially to the "faithful"

44 Catholic Child Emperor soldiers, of course the native ones, by which recently the anti-Germanic government had had the families of Germanic mercenaries stabbed in the cities of Italy. Furthermore, the removal of the images of the gods that are "still" in the temples

is commanded, "since this, as we know, has already been ordered repeatedly by imperial command". Further, pagan festivals must cease and private owners of pagan chapels must destroy them. A whole flood of decrees against pagans and "heretics" followed on November 24 and 27, 408, on January 15, 409, on February 1, April 1 and June 26, 409/6.

The Ravenna government issued a particularly serious decree against "wicked superstition" in 415. The state now confiscated all the properties of the temples. All income, which once belonged to "the rightly condemned superstition", should now belong to "our house". Also, all paganized ceremonies are abolished, certain pagan associations, perhaps formed to protect the temples, are banned, and their leaders, the chiliarchs and centonarians, are threatened with death. Finally, on December 7, 415, for the first time by legislative means, the recruitment of Old Believers into the civil service was prohibited.

They were no longer allowed to hold any administrative, judicial or military posts. De facto, already at that time, 47 Christian executives faced only three pagan ones. And in the last years of Honorius' reign, since 418, no high official of pagan denomination is attested.⁵⁷

Apparently at the suggestion of the African bishops, Honorius in 418 had also demanded, by an unusually rigorous rescript, the persecution of the "false teachers" Pelagius and Caelestius, their tracking down and deportation along with their followers (cf. 1498 ff). And in the same year the church enforced the exclusion of the Jews, whom the emperor equated with pagans and "heretics", from all dignities and offices. They were also removed from the army. On the island of Menorca there were even forced baptisms of Jews. Hundreds are forcibly converted to Catholicism; uncounted

Fight of Honorius against "heretics", pagans and Jews 45

Thousands later raped in the same way, especially in Spain. But the action in 418 was probably the first of its kind.⁵⁸

In the meantime, Honorius had repeatedly made Constantine's (III), a decorated officer from Naisus (Nissa), consul, also *magister militum*, and married him to his sister Galla Placidia, against her will, for

his services against the usurper Constantine III (p. 28), the Visigoths in 417, and probably also against pagans and "heretics" whose fight he relentlessly pursued. Constantius, a Christian who liked to decide ecclesiastical matters, had brought his friend and confidant Patroclus to the episcopal see of Arles in 412, and Boniface I to that of Rome in 418 (p. 130), had thrown Galla Placidia's (first) husband, Alaric's brother-in-law and successor Athaulf, across the Pyrenees only a year after the marriage, whereupon the king had been murdered in Barcelona and Placidia had been delivered to Ravenna by his successor, King Wallia, in 416. On February 8, 421, Honorius elevated Constantius III to co-ruler. The East, however, did not recognize him, and Constantius made preparations for war, including the papal claim to the prefecture of Illyricum, which politically belonged to Eastern Rome and was now to be ecclesiastically subordinated to the see of Constantinople. But Constantius III died already on September 2, 421 in Ravenna, where Honorius also died on August 15, 423. Now Constantius' son Valentinian III became emperor in the West, a four-year-old. So until 437 (until his marriage to Theodosius II's daughter Eudoxia) his pious mother Galla Placidia ruled for him. She had been Augusta since 421, but then, estranged from Honorius, fled to Constantinople in early 423, along with her children Honoria and Valentinian, where Theodosius II elevated Valentinian to Augustus, and she herself again to Augusta.⁵⁹

46 Catholic Child Emperors

Theodosius II - fulfiller of "all the precepts of Christianity."

Arcadius' son Theodosius II (408-450) was a seven-year-old child at the beginning of his reign. At first, therefore, the praetorian prefect Anthemius, an anti-Germanic military man who had already directed Arcadius, led the government. And in 414 he was succeeded by the emperor's sister, who was as bigoted as she was domineering.⁶⁰

St. Pulcheria, who vowed lifelong virginity-but in 450 made the swashbuckler Marcian happy with a "Joseph marriage"-was under the whisperings of bishops and monks and gained great power over Theodosius. He was similarly determined, at least temporarily, by his picture-perfect wife Eudokia (Athenais), the daughter of a pagan professor of rhetoric from Athens, who, after her baptism by Bishop Atticus of Constantinople, became a stirring proselyte and Pulcheria's rival with the emperor. In 441, perhaps expelled, she left the court and lived during her last two decades, building churches, writing godly things, fomenting sedition, in Jerusalem; at least the later Byzantines took this as exile. The pious regent had her spiritual advisors, the priest Severus, the deacon John, murdered by Saturninus, his comes domesticorum who had been ordered to Palestine, whereupon the latter was killed by the pious Eudokia, perhaps with her own hand.⁶¹

Surrounded by ambitious prayer sisters and zealot priests, Theodosius II "closely observed all the precepts of Christianity," as church historian Socrates extols, and "surpassed them all in mildness and humanity." Highly praised for his faith, he attacked "heretics", pagans, Jews in such a way that in April 423 he even certified himself by law: "Known and spread everywhere are our and our ancestors' decrees in which we suppressed the way of thinking and the audacity of the abominable pagans, Jews and also heretics". But now, the trend of suppressing Catholicism with coercion and

Theodosius II-----47

But now the trend to support Catholicism with coercion and force becomes even clearer; the behavior of those of other faiths becomes a "disease" that he, the emperor, must thwart as a "physician". His first duty was now once the care for the "vera religio", the true faith prerequisite of the general welfare.

"Heretics" were for him all and all "una perfidia".⁶²

As for the pagans, Theodosius assumed in 423 that there were none left at all. A pious wish. In reality, he had excluded them from higher positions and from military service only in 415. In 416 he threw all non-Christians out of state offices, in 423 he punished participation in sacrifices with banishment and confiscation of goods, in 435 and 438 the practice of pagan worship with the death penalty - even

referring to the bad harvests and epidemics caused by the worship of the gods. "We forbid all curse-worthy animal sacrifices and damnable sacrificial acts of the criminal pagan mode of thought, and all the rest forbidden by the authority of older ordinances. We order that all their sanctuaries, temples, and places of worship, if even now some of them have remained intact, be destroyed by official order, and that they be expiated by erecting the sign of our venerable Christian religion. To this end, let it be known to all that if anyone can be convicted before the competent judge, with suitable evidence, of having despised this law, he shall be punished by death."

The Catholic emperor, who so brutally ordered the destruction of the temples as well as purification (exorcism) with the cross, is said to have been a "heartly monarch, completely absorbed in family life", who "knowingly never signed a death sentence" (Thieß). In any case, it is a fact that the imperial code published before him in 438 – after the publication of which the Eastern Roman rulers hardly sent their decrees to the West, and the Western Roman rulers did not send theirs to the East at all – contains no less than 61 decrees against "heretics" between 381 and 435; before 381 only five.⁶³

As early as 418, the prince, who was only seventeen years old, had declared everything anti-Christian. 48 Catholic Child Emperors burned all anti-Christian literature. After all, in the later 4th and 5th centuries almost all non-Catholic literature was almost systematically destroyed, and the possession of "heretic" tracts was already threatened with death in 398. In 418, under Theodosius, probably the last copies of Porphyrios' fifteen books "Against the Christians" also flew into the fire, after Constantine had already ordered the burning of Porphyrios' work at the Council of Nicaea (325) (cf. I 210 ff).⁶⁴

Aggressive hostility to Jews in the

CHRISTIAN EAST

The Jews fared particularly badly under the second Theodosius.

As early as 408, the feast of Purim, a festival of joy, was banned because Jews had allegedly burned an imitation of the Holy Cross. In 415, the Jewish patriarch Gamaliel VI enforced a brutal law, behind which St. Pulcheria, the pious sister of the fourteen-year-old emperor, was then regent. Gamaliel lost the honorary prefecture and every right associated with it. He was no longer allowed to build synagogues, indeed, had to grind "superfluous" ones, summit of arrogant impudence! He was forbidden not only to arbitrate between quarreling Christians, but also between them and Jews. The latter were also again forbidden to circumcise gentiles and to keep Christian slaves. Rather, Christian slaves of Jews were to belong to the church. Thus, they did not get freedom, but the church got the legal succession! It is true that in the following years, as in earlier ones (cf. 1439 f), legal protective measures were also enacted against the Jews, who were being harassed ever more brazenly. But it speaks for itself when it says: "Their synagogues and dwellings shall not be burned [!] everywhere or blindly [!] and without any [!] reason be damaged ..." How little at all the imperial protective laws

Aggressive hostility to Jews in the Christian East 49

can be seen from the fact that they had to be renewed ten times in about thirty years. And once a synagogue

had been converted into a church, like the synagogues of Sardis (Asia Minor) or Gerasa (East Bank), it could be kept; the provision of a replacement site sufficed. In 423, the ruler threatened the circumcision of Christians with confiscation of goods and eternal banishment. He deprived the Jewish patriarch of the important patriarchal tax as well as his honorary titles and forbade the appointment of a successor after his death (around 425). On April 8, 426, a law of Theodosius encouraged the conversion of Jews to Christianity also through the law of inheritance; it forbade disinheriting a Jew or Samaritan who became a Christian. Even if (converting) children or grandchildren "can be proved to have committed a serious crime" against next of kin, mother, father, grandfather, grandmother, "... the parents must nevertheless ... leave them the share of the inheritance owed" – a quarter of the obligatory share – "since

they have surely at least earned that in honor of the chosen religion"! In 429 even the institution of the Jewish patriarchy, for centuries the guarantor of the unity of the ever more severely persecuted people, is finally abolished. After that, the heads of the Jews in both syn-edriums of Palestine or in other provinces have to pay back "everything" that "they received under the title of a levy after the patriarchs left." Also, more and more Jewish peasants of Palestine are ruined and displaced, more synagogues are destroyed, more Jewish properties are stolen, more murderers of Jews are not punished. And all this, profit and manslaughter, is mostly justified theologically! After all, Theodosius II, following the example of Honorius, brought back the equation of the Jews with pagans and "heretics".⁶⁵

When in 438 the relics of the revered anti-Semite and church scholar John Chrysostom were brought in, the moment seemed to have come for the emperor to enact another harsh law against the "deluded Jews, Samaritans, pagans and the other kinds of irreligious abominations. In the all-time wa-jo Catholic Child Emperor's concern for the true religion, the main object of his ruling activity, as he confessed at the outset, his constitution of January 31, 438 – following the process of even more anti-Jewish laws in the West – decreed the exclusion of Jews from all offices and dignities, from civil administration and the office of *defensor civitatis*, in order to deprive them of any possibility of condemning a Christian. He further forbade the building of synagogues or their expansion. "Whoever builds a synagogue shall know that he has worked for the profit of the Catholic Church.... And whoever has begun the building of a synagogue, and not merely repairing an existing one, shall be fined fifty pounds of gold for his audacity." And for inciting a Christian to apostasy, he set the death penalty.⁶⁶ One does not err in seeing the Christian church and theology behind all these highly aggressive, often already ruinous decrees of the Christian regent. Summing up, Franz Tinnefeid writes about the state policy towards the Jews in the three hundred years of the early Byzantine era, that is, in the period between the 4th and 6th centuries inclusive, "that it was precisely the emperors who took Christianity particularly seriously who made the greatest difficulties for Judaism. The enemy image of the Jew as the obdurate adversary of Christ is stronger than the idea of Christian love and reconciliation. Christian theologians have developed this image of the enemy and have thus given the theoretical basis to the attacks and assaults of Christians."⁶⁷

Murder upon Murder in the Catholic West 51

Murder upon Murder in the Catholic West

After the death of Honorius, Theodosius II apparently sought sole rule over the entire empire. Galla Placidia and her children Honoria and Valentinian had therefore received a less than friendly reception when they fled to the court in Constantinople in early 423. But when in December the *Primicerius notariorum* Johannes rose in Rome to the emperor of the west, Galla Placidia and her son received back the already withdrawn dignity of an Augusta, a *nobilissimus*, to save the west at least of the dynasty.

Usurper John, however, a Christian who was said to be a mild, just and – strangely enough at the time – anti-clerical government (since he curtailed the privileges of the Church and apparently granted full tolerance to all denominations), finally fell into the power of his enemies through treason at Ravenna.

Placidia had his right hand cut off, led him on a donkey through the circus of Aquileia, maltreated and beheaded in May/June 425 – "a barbaric aggravation of the death penalty, such as had been spared earlier usurpers and from which speaks an already quite medieval joy in torturing" (Stein).⁶⁸

After the defeat of John, Flavius Placidus Valentinianus III was elevated to Augustus, the (Western) Roman emperor, on October 23, 425. But for the next twelve years, his mother Galla Placidia ruled exclusively, advised by the three authoritative figures of the court, Felix, Boniface and Aetius.

Flavius Constantius Felix, a *magister utriusque militiae* since 425, was an imperial commander and a Christian. With his wife, he donated the apsis mosaic in the Lateran Basilica on the basis of a vow, which did not prevent him from killing the Roman deacon Titus; he is also said to have caused the

murder of the bishop of Arles, Patroclus (p. 250 f). In May 430, however, Felix himself was slain in Ravenna during a soldier's revolt, allegedly because of an intrigue against Aetius. In Felix's place Galla Placidia appointed the Comes Africae and Augustine's friend Boniface (I 526 f).

5z Catholic child emperors Two years later, however, civil war broke out between the latter and Aetius. Boniface was victorious at Rimini, but died three months later from a wound allegedly inflicted by Aetius in a duel.

Flavius Aetius, first a hostage of the Visigoths for three years, then of the Huns (as was his son later), finally, as the supreme army commander, indeed, the greatest Roman commander of the first half of the century, forced the Germanic tribes "under the Roman yoke in mighty battles" (lordanes). After victories over Visigoths and Franks, he destroyed the Burgundian empire on the Rhine in 436/37 with Hun mercenaries, and in 451, with decisive assistance from the Visigoths, he fought Attila's Huns at Troyes on the Catalaunian Fields with immense losses on both sides, with Germanic tribes, especially Ostrogoths, fighting with the Huns, and Burgundians and Franks fighting with Aetius.^{6'}

Valentinian and Galla Placidia began to fear the overpowering military, which largely directed foreign policy, more and more. It was suggested to the ruler that Aetius wanted to dethrone him, to put himself in his place. Working for Ravenna for decades and now sixty, the general had often fought with Hunnic support and some cover. But as the Hun empire crumbled, the emperor took heart. On September 21, 454, Catholic pious like his church-building mother, he led the first thrust against Aetius at an audience on the Palatine in Rome; the daggers of the court eunuchs finished him off. The praetorian prefect Boethius, who was his friend and accompanied him, was also stabbed; the corpses were on display in the Forum. And already on March 16 of the next year, Valentinian III, the last legitimate monarch of the West, himself succumbed to an officer's plot from the former retinue of Aetius in Rome during a visit to the Guard troops on the Field of Mars. The Theodosian dynasty, which had already ended in the East with the death of Theodosius* II in 450, thus also came to an end in the West. The presumed author of the assassination, the patrician Petronius Maximus, immediately became emperor, forced the empress widow Eudoxia to marry him, but was himself already three years dead.

Murder upon Murder in the Catholic West 53

months later while fleeing the Vandals, presumably at the hands of a bodyguard (p. 2,78).⁷⁰

At the court of Valentinian III, 29 Christian officials had still faced three godly ones, Volusianus and Theodosius in the high position of Italic imperial prefect, while the third pagan, Litorius, acted as army commander. However, already at the beginning of this reign, laws appeared with severe sanctions against all those of different faith. Against pagans, Jews, Pelagians and Caelestians, against the Manichaeans, even against schismatics who withdrew from communion with the "venerabilis papa" – a term used here for the first time in the Codex Theodosianus, where also "the aspect of terror.... is programmatically elevated to the ultima ratio of imperial religious policy" (Anton). This was to have far-reaching consequences, but already finds a counterpart in a letter of Pope Leo I, the first really important Roman bishop, who closely cooperated with the emperor, who since 439 often resided in Rome and was generous to the church, as his mother had been.⁷¹

However, before we turn to Leo I and the never-ending power struggle of the prelates in the West and East during the period just outlined in more "profane" historical terms, it is essential to look back at ecclesiastical Rome, first at its emergence and the usurpation of papal primacy.

z. CHAPTER

THE PAPAL PRIMACY OR THE "PETRA SCANDALI" TRIUMPH OF FRAUD AND GREED FOR POWER

"But when Cephas [Peter] came to Antioch, I withstood him to his face". The "Apostle to the Nations" Paul¹

"With us there is no bishop of bishops". St. Cyprian¹

"We are Christian, not Petrians". St. Augustine³

"Whoever retains the sobriety of judgment which is everywhere the first precept of research, for him the legend of Peter, the founder and first bishop of the Roman Church, remains what it is: a legend without a historical core, poetry without truth."

John Haller⁴

"The promise of Peter Mt 16,17-19 forms

a subsequent insertion. This insertion... in its present form is not a word of the "earthly Jesus" but a formation of the evangelist." "For the special primacy of the bishop of Rome the New Testament texts, with which one was used to justify this primacy up to the present, give nothing. This traditional line of argument is exegetically and historically no longer tenable."

Catholic theologian Josef Blank⁵

"Despite the attempt of the last Council to integrate the Pope into the Church, Vatican II speaks of the Pope more and more often than Vatican I did. The "Nota Praevia," which was added to the Constitution on the Church on the instruction of a "higher authority," even expressed papal authority with a sharpness that, at least in terms of wording, goes far beyond Vatican I. The Nota Praevia states:

"The pope shall be the head of the Church. It states, "The pope, as supreme pastor of the Church, may exercise his authority at any time as he sees fit (ad placitum), as his office requires.'" Catholic theologian Walter Kasper⁴

"We are fully aware that the Pope is the greatest obstacle on the road to ecumenism." Pope Paul VI (1967)⁷

We are Peter." Pope Paul VI (1969)¹

Neither did Jesus establish the papacy nor was Peter Bishop of Rome.

The Catholic Church justifies the foundation of the papacy and of herself with the passage in Matthew:

"You are Peter, and upon this rock [Petra] I will build my church ..." (Mt. 16:18).

In giant letters of gold mosaic, this word, arguably the most controversial in the Bible, shines from Michelangelo's dome in St. Peter's. However, it is missing in three of the four Gospels; above all, it is also missing in Mark, the oldest evangelist. For Jesus never spoke it; today "certain result of biblical exegesis" (Brox). There are a number of convincing reasons for this, already summarized by me elsewhere.⁹

The Catholic Church, of course, holds fast to its "divine institution". It must; it has maintained it through two millennia. Not a few of its theologians, however, capitulate now. Some of them develop - in belated succession to rather conservative Protestants - a way of speaking that lets them perhaps still halfway save their "scientific" face and yet not immediately lose everything with their superiors. They paraphrase the inauthenticity of the "church foundation word" for instance: Matthew did not refer to it historically, but composed it theologically. Or they call the "rock passage" a commissioning only by the "Risen One". Those who are not so keen, however, explain the "promise of Peter" as a later insertion, as a creation of the evangelist only.¹⁰

But perhaps Peter even had a kind of primacy, a certain

Jesus did not establish the papacy ⁵⁷

guiding function. Perhaps, however, only temporarily, merely in certain areas, not after the "Council of the Apostles." Paul, who resists Peter "to his face" in Antioch, calling him a hypocrite, apparently also otherwise often secretly polemicizes against a claim of leadership by Peter. Also in other parts of the "Holy Scriptures" there are "anti-Petrine" tendencies. And that Peter retained his primacy when he had it, possibly even only as a creation of the "Peter party," is nowhere to be found in the New Testament. It is silent on the subject.¹¹

But even if – in many respects excluded – the "primitive word" came from Jesus: never could the church explain how it passes from Peter to the "popes", never could it substantiate that it applies not only to the apostle, but also to all his "successors in office". Neither the Bible nor (any other) historical source ever refers to the appointment of a successor by Peter, to a "Petrine succession".

Thus, many a Catholic now finds the "exegetical discussion" "extremely differentiated" and, in view of the findings, "comes into some embarrassment when he tries to illuminate the viability of the biblical basis for the papacy in a historical-critical way" (Stockmeier). More courageous theologians of this camp, however, concede that there is "no question" of a succession to Peter (de Vries); that it "cannot be found anywhere in the New Testament" (Schnackenburg). Yes, Josef Blank finds Peter's rock-foundation function not only unique, not only untransferable, inconvertible, unrepeatable, but sees in the idea of a constantly growing foundation already purely figuratively an inner impossibility. In this respect, the papacy cannot be understood as the rock of Peter either. Rather, this Catholic asserts flatly: "In retrospect of church history, one could rather say: Even the papacy.... Has not been able to destroy the Church." And finally, the theologian goes on to ask how early Christianity understood the saying? Was it referred to Rome or the primacy of the Roman bishop as successor to the apostle Peter? "The answer here is simply, no!"¹²

58 Papal primacy or the "petra scandali."

It is true that apologetics invokes further words or directives of Jesus to Peter: that he catch men, get the keys of the kingdom of heaven; that whatever he binds or loosens on earth is also bound, loosed in heaven; finally, "Strengthen your brethren," "Feed my lambs." But to all this there are further evangelical or New Testament parallels that show: Jesus' five injunctions were not bound in principle to Peter. And above all, once again: There is no mention of a successor, a leader even of the Roman congregation as head of a universal church, in any early Christian text.¹³

Peter's stay and death in Rome

ARE UNPROVEN

Peter was also never bishop of Rome—an absurd thought, but the basis of the whole doctrine of Peter played literally sky-high by the popes and their theologians; it is not even certain that he was ever in Rome.

The Roman Christian community was not built by either Peter or Paul, the "blessed founding apostles." Irenaeus (in the 6th century Archbishop Dorotheus of Thessalonike even attributed a double bishopric to them!), but by unknown Jewish Christians. There were already so heavy riots between these and the Jews that emperor Claudius in the middle of the 1st century expelled Jews like Christians, between whom one did not differentiate yet at all, let expel: "Judaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit" (Suetonius). The then expelled couple Aquila and Priscilla met Paul on his second missionary journey in Corinth. – According to Tacitus, the Roman Christians were criminals from Judea.¹⁴

A stay of Peter in Rome has never been proved so far, even if today, at the time of ecumenism, the mutual rapprochement of the Christian churches, even many Protestant scholars assume it – assumptions are not proofs; even if

Peter's stay and death in Rome are unproven ⁵⁹

Even if Peter's stay and death in Rome are unproven, imaginative legends have him suffer martyrdom in Rome: dramatically on the cross, like his Lord and Savior, but, at his own request, out of humility, with his head down ... And even if a certain Gaius – almost one and a half centuries later! – "already" believed to know the place, namely at the Vatican, that is in the Neronian Gardens, which moreover is reported for the first time by Bishop Euseb in the 4th century! Even who, like Daniel O'Connor, wants to prove with great effort a visit of Peter to Rome, yes, definitely claims in the title, "Peter in Rome: the Literary, Liturgical and Archaeological Evidence", comes nevertheless only to the somewhat meager result that

this stay is "more plausible than not".¹⁵

In reality, there is not a single piece of solid evidence for it. Especially Paul – who is supposed to have founded the Roman church together with Peter, who writes his last letters from Rome, but never mentions Peter, his opponent, in them – knows nothing about it. Nothing is also read about it in the Acts of the Apostles, the synoptic gospels. Also the important 1st Epistle to the Clement, probably from the end of the 1st century, knows neither the Tu-es-Petrus story nor another appointment of Peter by Jesus, nor any decisive role of this apostle at all. He only communicates in vague words his martyrdom. In short, the whole 1st century is silent about it, as still long the z.¹⁶

The oldest sure witness for Peter's stay in Rome, Dionysius of Corinth, however, is suspect. First, because his testimony dates only from around 170. Secondly, because this bishop sits far away from Rome. And third, because he claims not only that Peter and Paul founded the church of Rome together, but also that of Corinth, which for Corinth refutes Paul's own testimony. Will such a warrant deserve more confidence with regard to Roman tradition?¹⁷

But who doubts here, denies even, sets "only his ignorance and his fanaticism a dishonoring monument" (Catholic Gröne). But is it not rather the other way around? Is fanaticism not more frequent among believers than among skeptics? And ignorance

60 The papal primacy or the "petra scandali"

heit usually also? Do not the religions, Catholicism and papacy in particular, live from both? Don't their dogmas amount to the contrarational and supranatural, to logical absurdities? Don't they shun real enlightenment, real criticism more than anything else? Have they not brought sharp censorship, the index, the ecclesiastical printing license, the anti-modernist oath and the stake?¹⁸

Catholics need the visitation of Peter, need a corresponding activity of this man in Rome, since he leads the Roman list of bishops as the "founding apostle", the chain of his "successors". The "apostolic" tradition and the primacy of the pope are based to a considerable extent on this teaching. Ergo, they claim, especially in popular writings, Peter's presence in Rome "is proven by historical research to be beyond all doubt" (F. J. Koch); "is generally secured research result" (Kösters SJ); stands "unimpeachably firm" (Franzen); testifies "the whole ancient Christian world" (Schuck); "never" there are

news from ancient times "which are so certain" (Kuhn) – which also does not make the vivid picture more certain, Peter had "set up his episcopal chair", "his episcopal seat in Rome" (Specht/Bauer).¹⁹

In 1982 it is also for the Catholic Pesch "no longer doubtful" that Peter suffered martyrdom in Rome under Nero. (But martyr bishop Ignatius in the 2nd century does not say anything about it yet!) Even for the whole today's "research" Pesch (who loves the phrase, "if I see right") claims this indubitable. A proof he – or anyone! – not. It is to him only, so immediately in the sentence before, "a delightful idea to assume that Peter set out for Rome ...".²⁰

It is also an attractive idea for many Catholics to possess the tomb of St. Peter. But what about the provability?

The Tale of the Found Tomb of St. Peter 61

The fairy tale of the found grave of St. Peter

According to an old tradition, the tomb of the "Prince of the Apostles" is located on the Via Appia, according to another version under St. Peter's Church.¹¹

After apparently searching for this tomb already around the middle of the z. century, more recently, between 1940 and 1949, the archaeologist Enrico Josi, the architect Bruno Apolloni-Ghetti, the Jesuit Antonio Ferrua, the Jesuit Engelbert Kirschbaum dug under St. Peter's dome. The director was Prelate Kaas, former president of the Center. He had left the present to Hitler in Berlin and was similarly successful in tracing the past in Rome ... ,²²

The world war came and went. And on the eve of Christmas 1950, Pius XII announced to the eagerly

awaiting (Catholic) humanity that the "researches which We had in mind from the first months of Our Pontificate" had, "at least as far as they concern the tomb of the Apostle, come to a happy conclusion in the course of the Jubilee Year." The result of the research, "the very precise research," the Pope called "of the highest richness and importance," and "to the essential question, the question of whether the tomb of St. Peter has really been found again, the final result of the work and studies answers with a very clear yes. The tomb of the Prince of the Apostles has been found again." ²³

The very next year, however, the Catholic "Herder-Korrespondenz Orbis Catholicus" wrote rather meekly: the place where Peter was buried had "undoubtedly been found again", the "apostle's tomb itself has no longer been found" – a word that betrays the art of formulation and the Catholic school. Finally, one did not like to contradict the pope directly.

However, according to the Herder correspondence, "a sure circumstantial proof of the fact" was provided that Peter's tomb "lay under the center of St. Peter's Basilica." As "circumstantial evidence," one reported "at the conjectured site.... a number of human bones, which were carefully raised"; furthermore, still Christian

6z Papal primacy or "petra scandalii" and pagan tombs, the latter "in several layers one above the other." The apostle's tomb, the one no longer found, is said by the commission report to have been devastated over time, the bones of Peter moved to other places of "safety" during the persecutions, until finally Constantine built a place of worship "over the venerable site." ²⁴

Finally, Herder notes the exclusion of "the public in the foreseeable future" from "the venerable place." Reasons: the narrowness of the access; the endangerment of archaeological monuments in the immediate vicinity; then the actual reason, revealingly enough: "because finally an archaeologically inexperienced eye would see little or nothing worth thinking about there" ²⁵.

So with this it behaves as with all great mysteries of this religion: nothing memorable.

Around 200, the Roman presbyter Gaius thought he knew the tomb of Peter, "on the Vatican"; and the tomb of Paul on the "road to Ostia." And since Constantine I, people have supposedly venerated – and searched for – Peter's tomb in St. Peter's. But its historical authenticity was and is not proven by this; at most, the belief of the Constantinian period that it possessed Peter's tomb. This belief, however, proves no more than the same belief today. ²⁶

What has been found, on the other hand, under St. Peter's (near which stood the Phrygianum, a sanctuary of the goddess Cybele) is a quantity of pagan tombs: in the latest excavations, no fewer than 22 mausoleums and two open grave-yards. ²⁷

However, as void as the result is with regard to the Vatican object of search, so luxuriantly the literature proliferates around it. In 1964 there were already about 400 publications about it with the most diverse views – "from the most naive enthusiasm to the harshest denial of the excavation results". The judgement Engelbert Kirschbaums SJ, who must dismiss first of all too benevolent older researches himself. Those of his colleague Grisar were made "with insufficient means"; and those of the "meritorious" Silesian archaeologist Joseph Wil-

The Fairy Tale of the Found Tomb of St. Peter 63

pert had been passed over in silence by the experts as a "regrettable critical aberration of the highly aged scholar"? ⁸

Jesuit Kirschbaum, for his part, compiles a whole "chain of evidence" for the authenticity of the tomb of Peter. But then he has to "admit that individual parts could also be interpreted differently"; "that we only have the place, the burial place of the apostle, and no longer the material components of this tomb"; that we can – what luck for him! – "can never look at who was buried in it". Also about the appearance of the famous tomb he "cannot say certain things.... he cannot say anything definite... It must have been a poor tomb ..." In short, what was found factually? The Jesuit almost says it: "a tomb that

consisted only of a few cover bricks. When these were taken away, nothing remained of the tomb
"❖"

Everything speaks for the fact that this is not the tomb of Peter under the so-called tropaion, but that this itself is only a cenotaph, a monument. The excavation report, however, according to Kirschbaum, "interprets the tropaion as the tomb of the apostle, albeit in a further stage of its development".³⁰ The results of critical researchers – Adriano Prandi, Armin von Gerkan, Theodor Kiauser, A. M. Schneider and others – at least forced the Jesuit to concede that the (Catholic) excavation report was not "free of errors". He admits "incompleteness of the description", speaks of "smaller or larger contradictions", calls the *errare humanum est* "thus unfortunately still true". But the crucial point, he wants to "believe," has not shaken the criticism "in any way.... shaken". But finally also Engelbert Kirschbaum can only state: "So was the tomb of Peter found? We answer: the tropaion from the middle of the second century was found, but the associated apostle's tomb was not /found" in the same sense, but proven, that is, through a chain of circumstantial evidence its existence was established, although "material parts" of this original tomb

64 The papal primacy or the "petra scandali"

bes no longer exist." Ergo: the tomb was there, but no longer there!³¹

"Gladly the imagination would like to imagine how the body of the first pope was laid in the earth," writes Kirschbaum SJ, assuming the removal of Peter's bones from his tomb in 2.58. Of course without any trace of proof. Also he can merely "believe ... that one took only the head". Because the rest one would have found in the grave which one has not found (likewise)! However, the alleged head of Peter (and Paul) in the Lateran is provable only since the end of the n. century! Century! But there, where one assumes the grave of Peter, one found "a heap of bones", and they all belong "to the same person", as the "medical examination resulted". Yes, it is certain "that they are indeed the bones of an old man. And Peter was an old man at his death" (Kirschbaum SJ). Such an amazing "proof" that even Engelbert Kirschbaum does not dare to say a "definitive word about it." ³²

But in 1965 Margherita Guarducci, a professor of antiquities at the University of Rome, claimed in a sensational book to have discovered the relics of St. Peter beyond doubt. But since one did not even have the tomb of Peter, at least the professional world reacted to the new "discovery" in a duly scanty manner and then "often dismissively unfriendly" (Dassmann). Ernst Dassmann himself analyzed the circumstantial edifice of the Guarducci's writing published by the Vatican and concluded his all but unfriendly misgivings with the demand of the old master of hagiography, H. Delehaye, that all relics not beyond all doubt must be considered false. "The only thing, however, that is established without doubt should be the doubts that must continue to attach to M. Guarducci's argumentation in the state of things." ³³

When Venerando Correnti, a renowned anthropologist, examined the bones of the "vecchio robusto," the alleged bones of Peter, he identified them as the remains of three

The fairy tale of the found tomb of Peter 65

individuals, including almost certainly (quasi certamente) those of an old woman of about seventy.³⁴ Pope Paul VI, however, announced on June 26, 1968, during his address in the General Audience, "The relics of St. Peter have been identified in a way that We can accept as convincing." ³⁵

In reality, however, any identification among the heap of buried people after almost two thousand years would be impossible from the outset, even if Peter were lying there. Rightly, Erich Caspar has already emphasized, carefully enough, the doubts about it "will never be resolved". Rightly Johannes Haller has reminded in this connection of the skepticism concerning the authenticity of the skulls of Schiller and Bach, although the temporal distance is smaller, the conditions are so much better. Armin von Gerkan rightly writes that even if the tomb of Peter were

uncovered, even if inscriptions were in favor of it – but all this is not the case –, even then nothing would be gained, "because even this burial would only date from Constantinian times, and it would remain questionable, even possible, that it was a fiction. There is just no archaeological material, but it will always have to remain only with the tradition, which existed, however, already in the time of Constantine."36

What the lazy story of Peter's tomb is really about is written by Catholic Fuchs (to whom we also owe the exciting report: "Several meters below the present Pope's altar an inscription PETR.... was found, next to it bones, besides an old tomb..."): "Above all, however, these excavations are suitable to carry the idea of Peter's tomb more strongly to the people". This is indeed the crux of the matter. For the primacy of the Pope is not based on the fact that Peter is buried in Rome. But the popular piety is concerned with this belief, with the pilgrims; "Terra santa!": the spendthrift.37

Thus, Monsignor Rathgeber also emphasizes that the site- "certainly" Peter's tomb- has been "a much-visited

66 The papal primacy or the "petra scandali"

place of pilgrimage". The prelate mentions a stone discovered there not only with the inscription: "Peter, ask Jesus Christ for the holy Christian men buried next to your body", but also with a likeness that is considered a portrait of the apostle: a bald head, big nose, beard and fleshy lips.... Oh, would there still be miracles, if Peter (and Paul) had not long been pulled out of the depths so fresh and crispy, as once Ambrose his martyrs (I 431 ff)?! But the times are no longer after it.... "Miracles must be seen at a distance," says Lichtenberg, "if they are to be considered true, like clouds, if they are to be considered solid bodies."38

Now, despite everything, Peter may have been in Rome, perhaps even died there, though not as a bishop, as the holder of the "Holy See" named after him. "Of this," writes Kurt Aland in 1981, "there can now be no question at all." And Norbert Brox, who in 1983 wants to know "with great certainty" that Peter was in Rome, nevertheless admits that nothing is known about his role in the community there. "That he was their bishop is out of the question ..." In any case, the author of the 1st Epistle of Peter did not imagine the "apostle of Jesus Christ" in "Babylon," that is, Rome, as a bishop, but, according to the Protestant theologian Felix Christ, "as a preacher and, above all, "a fellow elder." Also for the Catholic Blank Peter was "most probably not the "first bishop of Rome>" (and of course also "not the founder of the Roman community"). Is there nevertheless even for the quite line-loyal Rudolf Pesch in Rome "at first" (!) no episcopate. Both Peter and Paul, "both apostles did not have a direct "successor" in a Roman episcopate". But at the conclusion of this Catholic's study, the papal primacy is "the Catholic primacy of Peter involved in the apostolic succession of the apostles in the episcopate in service to the faith of the one, holy Church", this is "factum theologicum", in German: an imposture. Or, again with Pesch, "a delightful notion to assume that..."."

But before we consider the emergence and development of the Roman

The emergence of the ecclesiastical offices 67

primacy, the question naturally arises: how had Christian priests, bishops, popes come into existence in the first place?

The origin of the ecclesiastical offices, metropolitan and patriarchal sees and the papacy

According to all that the historical-critical Bible exegesis teaches, Jesus – the apocalyptic who stands completely in the tradition of Jewish prophets, who expects the immediate end, the "reign of God" breaking in, and thus is completely mistaken (one of the most certain research results) – of course did not want to found a church at all, to appoint priests, bishops, patriarchs, popes. In 1987, not without scorn, the church historian and feminist theologian Magdalene Bussmann wrote to John Paul II: "Jesus also did not commission anyone, women or men, with the priesthood as you and your colleagues understand it.

All people who have a charism given by God are to bring it to bear for the good of the entire community. This is probably the common opinion of all theo-logists/theologians, and in Rome at least a minimum of basic exegetical knowledge of serious biblical interpretation should be assumed. "40 In the earliest Christian communities, apostles, prophets, and teachers set the tone. The bishops, deacons, and presbyters took a back seat to them. At first they were only technical administrators, entrusted with administrative, organizational, economic-social functions. Then the bishop took the lead: first over the presbyters, to whom he was equal in rank throughout the 1st century, and finally also over the charismatics, the apostles, prophets and teachers. From the end of the 2nd century, he united all offices to his person.⁴¹

68 The papal primacy or the "petra scandali".

But just as the bishop went from being subordinate to being equal, then superior, so rank distinctions again formed among the bishops themselves. They usually depended on the importance of the place where they resided. A bishop with his seat in the provincial capital, the metropolis, usually also became metropolitan (metropolitans, although some, especially in Illyricum, also called themselves archbishop, archiepiscopus) and superior of the other bishops of his ecclesiastical administrative area, the boundaries of which usually coincided with those of the corresponding civil one; a development that more or less came to an end in the East in the early 3rd century, of course not without rivalries. And by 400 at the latest, each province then had a metropolitan.⁴²

Even among the metropolitans, however, there were bishops with greater authority, such as in Upper Italy the bishop of Milan, since Diocletian imperial residence; probably the main reason why the Milanese episcopus commanded several civil provinces. And finally there were church federations, which considerably exceeded even a metropolitan federation, a kind of Oberbischoftum. In the 3rd century – by the way, again in alignment of the ecclesiastical-organizational structure with administrative units of the empire – some prelates gained special privileges: above all the patriarch of Alexandria vis-à-vis the approximately hundred bishops of Egypt. Or, somewhat later, the patriarch of Antioch (with a politically and culturally less uniform hinterland) vis-à-vis a large part of the Syrian episcopate. Analogous special rights were given at the Council of Nicaea (325): the less important subsequent patriarchate of Jerusalem (with three Palestinian provinces, admittedly achieved only in 451 by the unscrupulous opportunist and forger Archbishop Juvenal), as well as the exarchates of Ephesus, Caesarea in Cappadocia and Heraclea; finally, at the Council of Constantinople (381), the capital of the East. The title of patriarch (original father), at first also adorning ordinary bishops, was reserved from the 5th century only to five chief bishops, called "exarchs" in the Chalcedonense, the Kir

The forged Roman bishop list 69

The bishops of Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople, Jerusalem and Rome.

Now, especially in Rome the office of a ruling bishop existed particularly late, only in the fourth or fifth Christian generation, much later than in Syria or Asia Minor, for example. Even in the middle of the 2nd century, when the Roman Christian community had about 30,000 members and 155 clergy, no one there knew of a foundation by Peter! No one anything about his stay and martyrdom in Rome.⁴³

The falsified Roman bishop list

The oldest Roman list of bishops was provided by the church father Irenaeus, bishop of Lyon, in his writing "Adversus haereses", between 180 and 185. It is not available in the original Greek text, but completely in a Latin reproduction from the 3rd or 4th, if not the 5th century. The literature alone on this is hardly overlookable, the text obviously "corrupted". Completely in the dark one gropes however over the origin of the listing. Irenaeus does not give much more than names. And nowhere is spoken of a primacy of Peter! Peter was still not counted as a bishop in Rome at the end of the 2nd century. In the 4th century, however, one claims that he had been there for 25 years! At that time bishop Euseb handed

down the Roman episcopal succession, a dishonest historian, even guilty of falsification of documents (cf. among others I 200 ff). Euseb also "improved" the Alexandrian bishop list, which most resembles his Roman one. Likewise the Antiochian one, assigning the names of the bishops Cornelius, Eros and Theophilus each to an Olympiad. He also worked with artificial calculations for the Jerusalem bishop's table, of whose years of office he admittedly possessed "no written news at all"; later Bishop Epiphanius dated them exactly after imperial equinoxes. Around 354, the "Catologus Liberia.

70 The papal primacy or the "petra scandali"

nus," a directory of popes extending from Peter to Liberia (352-366), continued and "perfected" the dating procedure by giving the dates of months and days. So catholic Gelmi, who adds, of course, immediately, "that all these dates have no historical value". Today, however, also the Catholics agree in it, but emphasize again and again: the more valuable is the series of names itself – ancient and genuine! Still the "Liber Pontificalis", the official papal book, the oldest Roman bishop list, which contains an "abundance of falsified or legendary material" and this "supplemented by further inventions" (Caspar), in short, which is so swindled that it has hardly historical value up to the turn of the 6th century, names not Peter, but a Linus as the first bishop of the city.

Then one put Linus in the second place and Peter in the first. At last one constructed a "Petrine office", which "in the ancient conditions" of course emerged "only occasionally" (Karrer), and let it molt into the "papacy". "Like a seed," writes Jesuit Hans Grotz poetically, "Peter fell into Roman soil." And however many fell into it and still fall – gradually one could enumerate all the "successors" of Peter, as mentioned, with dates of years and deaths, supposedly in uninterrupted succession. In the course of time, however, the Roman list of bishops was rewritten, improved, supplemented, and finally a table of the years of office for the first 28 bishops of Rome, compiled from five Byzantine chroniclers, shows agreement of the numbers in all columns in only four places. Yes, the final redactor of the text, perhaps Pope Gregory I, seems to have extended the series of names, in parallel with the twelve apostles, to twelve saints. In any case, the episcopates of the Roman bishop list for the first two centuries are as uncertain as those of the Alexandrian or Antiochian and "for the first decades bare arbitrariness" (Heussi).⁴⁴

It fits with this that at the head of the official papal book is a forged correspondence of St. Jerome with Pope Damasus I.

The forged Roman bishop list 71

stands! (Not the only forged correspondence between the two: Pseudoisidor brings another.)⁴⁵

Jesuit Grisar does emphasize "the circumstance" that "the list of ancient Roman bishops, beginning with St. Peter, stands out very favorably against very many [!] other catalogs of bishops in terms of certainty of order and names. For while poetry and forgery have not intruded here, the directories of the ancient rulers of other churches have been a favorite field in which the labors of inventors have tried their hand." But in fact, the Roman bishops' catalog, undoubtedly particularly significant for Catholics, was no different from other bishops' lists.⁴⁶

Incidentally, such partially constructed, completely fictitious or artificially bridged name series, tradition tables existed long before Christianity and its – in the beginnings (likewise) falsified – bishop lists: the magistrate registers of the Greek city states, the Spartan king registers of the Agiads and Eurypontids, the diadochal series of the school heads in the Greek philosopher schools, the rubric of the Olympians. But above all comparable: the Old Testament genealogies, which guaranteed the participation in the divine promises in gapless name sequence, especially the post-exilic high priest list as government list of Israel. And it is presumably to these Jewish principles of tradition that Islam also traces its efforts to safeguard the traditional oral teachings by virtue of a chain of succession, a series of witnesses (isnād) extending all the way to the prophet.⁴⁷

In any case, the historical reasons – not the theologically composed ones! – for the emergence of the papacy are of a completely different nature than the papacy itself would have us believe. They do not result from the supposed apostolic foundation of the Roman episcopal see, but above all from the high political-ideological and cultural importance of the city of millions, from its special position as the center of the Roman Empire, the "Queen Rome," indeed, as the pagan

7x The papal primacy or the "petra scandali".

poets praise her, as "caput orbis," "head of the world," a decisive factor that the Roman hierarchs characteristically pass over in corresponding pronouncements.

Not only in Rome, but everywhere the ecclesiastical rank of a city was more or less adequate to its older political rank, and the local churches made greater or lesser profit from other secular seats of government. This is true of Milan, for example, or, in neighboring Pannonia, of Sirmium, also a temporary imperial residence and seat of a Praefectus praetorio. And when in the late 4th century the Gallic prefecture came to Arles, the bishop there also immediately laid claim to the metropolitan dignity.⁴⁸

Byzantium, however, was especially quick to come to the fore. For between 326 and 330, Byzantium, which was small but militarily and economically favored by its location, had developed under Constantine I into the "Constantine City," the "Second" or "New Rome," "Nea Rhome." It was magnificently built over seven hills in competition with the old capital on the Tiber, but on its model, and surpassed it in grandeur and world standing as late as the 4th and 5th centuries, so that, though only a thousand years afterward, the late Byzantine scholar Manuel Chrysoloras boasts: "The mother is beautiful and shapely, but in many things the daughter is more beautiful." Constantinople played the leading role in the entire empire politically, militarily and economically. Its patriarch was gradually placed alongside the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, eventually becoming "imperial bishop" and a rival to the Roman bishop; invoking also that Christianity had begun in the East, that "in the East Christ was born," as the synodals of the imperial council of 381 trumpeted to the West. And after the invasion of the Arabs in the 7th century, Constantinople alone remained at last as the important patriarchate of the Orient.⁴⁹

Another important reason for the emergence of the papacy was the authoritative position given to the Roman bishop, the only patriarch in the entire West (while in the East three,

Emerging claims to primacy ⁷³

four patriarchs rivaled each other), in Italy and the Latin Church after the collapse of the Imperium Romanum, and which his soon-to-be vast wealth further supported. Then, as the primacy was formed, the factual power became more and more theologically underpinned by the alleged proof of apostolicity, the brazen recourse to Peter, Petrinology.⁵⁰

Emerging claims to primacy

These primacy ambitions of the Roman bishops, mostly justified by Mt. 16:18, are admittedly bottomlessly arrogant. For more than two centuries they themselves never insisted on their (alleged) appointment by Jesus! They never insisted on being successors of Peter! "It cannot be seen that the Peter-promise Matth. 16,18", Henry Chadwick points out, "would have played a role in the history of Roman claims to leadership and authority before the middle of the third century". It is only since then that there is the first securely vouched claim to primacy by a Roman bishop – a fact that Jesuit de Vries admits almost cynically: "We must admit that it took a long time for Rome to recognize the full significance of the word of the rock for the Petrine office of the bishop of Rome. But it was finally recognized..." Not even the idea of a special status of the Roman "see holder" as "successor" of Peter was developed in Rome! Every episcopal see, even the most inconsequential, neither outstanding by tradition nor significant, was first "sedes apostolica". And every bishop also claimed the epithet

"apostolicus" as well as the noun "apostolatus" for his dignity and activity. "The designation of a simple bishop as summus pontifex is even traceable for the first time in a papal letter" (Catholic Baus). Also, the oldest chief shepherds of Rome did not feel themselves to be "popes" at all. They

74 The papal primacy or the "petra scandali"

had for a long time "no other title... than the other bishops" (Catholic Bihlmeyer). On the contrary. While in the East patriarchs, bishops, abbots had long been dubbed "pope" (pappas, papa, father), the designation was first attested in Rome on a tombstone from the time of Liberius (352–366). It also became established in the West in the later 5th century, where Roman bishops regularly used the word "pope," along with other bishops, as a self-appellation but not before the late 8th century. And only from the 2nd millennium onwards the word "Pope" becomes an exclusive prerogative of the Bishop of Rome, indeed, even in the 9th and 12th centuries non-Roman bishops call themselves "vicarius Petri" (deputy of Peter). And the title "Summus Pontifex" even exists for all bishops until the high Middle Ages.⁵¹

Consequently, the primacy of the "pope" has been disputed ever since there has been talk of it. First by Catholic theologians, Church Fathers, bishops themselves.

The whole ancient church did not know any honorary and legal primacy of the bishop of Rome, founded by Jesus.

The earliest to refer to Mt 16,18 was probably the imperious Stephen I (254–257). With his hardly collegial episcopal but hierarchical-monarchical view of the church, he is in a way the first pope, even if we have no direct statement from him on the matter. But immediately the influential bishop Firmilian of Caesarea in Cappadocia reacted. According to the Catholic "Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche" (Dictionary of Theology and Church), he "does not know the legal primacy of the Roman bishop". Rather, Firmilian rebukes him for boasting of his position and believing that he "holds the succession of Peter" (successionem Petri tenere contendit). Without hesitation, Firmilian speaks of the "so solid and obvious foolishness of Ste.

The whole ancient church knew no primacy of honor and right 75

phans" and calls him, in direct address, a "schisma-ticus" who separated himself from the Church. He accuses him of "insolence and impudence" (audacia et insolentia), "blindness" (caecitas), "stupidity" (stultitia). Incensed, he compares him to Judas and claims that he brings "the blessed apostles Peter and Paul into bad repute." ⁵²

"How zealously," Firmilian sneers in a letter to Cyprian of Carthage, "did Stephen heed the apostle's salutary admonitions, preserving above all humility and meekness! What could be more humble and meek than to be at variance with so many bishops of the whole world ..., soon with the Orientals (as will also be well known to you), soon with you in the West."

And directly he apostrophized the Roman: "You have excluded yourself – do not indulge in any deception about this!... For while you think that all may be excluded from you, you have separated only yourself from all." ⁵³

And at that time, during the heresy controversy Z55/56 (on the question of whether Christians who converted to Catholicism had to be baptized or, as Rome taught, no longer baptized: what concerned disciplinary and dogmatic matters), no less a person than Cyprian took a stand on the question of primacy. The bishop, martyr and saint of the Catholica, obviously in agreement with the prevailing view, nowhere recognized an absolute primacy of Rome, recognized, as he mocks – with Tertullian (against Callist: p. 98) – "no bishop of bishops"; with which, indeed, the synods of North Africa at that time agreed, as well as those of the East, both in open conflict and in more tranquil times.

For Cyprian, the Roman bishop is fundamentally no more than any other bishop. "Not in a dream does he think of granting him even a rudimentary jurisdiction over other communities than his own. Indeed,

not even as first among equals (*primus inter pares*) is the successor of Peter considered by him" (Wickert). All apostles were equal for Cyprian, all had the "same authority" as Peter, "the same share of honor". Thus, no bishop was subject to another, no one was superior;

76 The papal primacy or the *petra scandal*

In short, each is responsible to God alone for the administration of his diocese: which is why in Rome even a main passage of Cyprian's writings was forged! But not even the forgery (in "*De unitate ecclesiae*" c. 4) is to be understood in the sense of a Roman primacy. But Cyprian was supported by two other synods (after earlier synods in Carthage and Asia Minor had already judged in conformity), and at the council on September 1, 256 in Carthage 87 bishops agreed with him in a roll call vote. The "Pope", of course, did not receive Cyprian's delegation with the resolutions, refused it also the ecclesiastical *communio*, any reception and hospitality. He energetically forbade rebaptism, because "nothing shall be renewed that has not been handed down" (*nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est*) – probably the oldest general principle of the papacy; which, of course, no one broke more than the papacy itself. Stephen I called St. Cyprian a "pseudo-Christian" and a "false apostle," a "deceitful intriguer" (*Pseudochristum et pseudoapostolum et dolosum operarium*), while Cyprian accused the "pope" of error, stubbornness, arrogance, blasphemy, and even of being "a friend of heretics and an enemy of Christians" – two saints among themselves.⁵⁴

After all, Cyprian did not excommunicate Stephen during this time of most abrupt confrontation with him, as far as is known; it would have been "quite to be expected" (Marschall). On the other hand, because of the scanty source material, it is still controversial whether Stephen of Rome excommunicated St. Cyprian; there is much to be said for it. Well-known Protestants, Seeberg for instance, Lietzmann, claim this, recently (rather) supported by the Catholic "*Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte*". Later, Augustine launched the report of Cyprian's recantation, but apparently contrary to the facts (and with little approval in historiography).⁵⁵

However, since Cyprian in particular is considered typical of the Catholicism of the West, a landmark in its development, Catholics readily dispute his denial of primacy. And really

The whole ancient church did not know honorary and legal primacy 77

he coined the terms "*cathedra Petri*" and "*primatus Petri*," which have had such a devastating effect on history up to the present day, he included the Matthew passage "Do it to Peter" in his texts and thus almost preceded the Roman doctrine of Peter, if not even directed Rome onto this track in the first place, onto the mastery of history by means of the Bible, dogmatics, and doctrine.⁵⁶

Cyprian, after all, also invokes the "*Ecclesia principalis* ... from whence the priestly unity proceeded."

And once this passage was very controversial, it was supposed to be striking witness for Rome's primacy; Hugo Koch, the Catholic church historian, lost his magisterium in 1912 when he proved the opposite – and soon not only in a book. In the meantime, however, also many Catholics agree that "*Ecclesia principalis*" does not mean papal primacy, that also Cyprian did not ascribe a hierarchical special position to the bishops of Rome, no "highest governmental power" (Bihlmeyer), no "supreme power" (Bernhart), that this primacy played at that time also in Catholicism as good as no role.⁵⁷

It speaks volumes that the entire ancient church does not know any honorary and legal primacy of the Roman bishop established by Jesus. That this primacy contradicts the teaching of all the ancient Church Fathers, even the most famous. For like Cyprian, Origen, the greatest, though heretical, theologian of the first three centuries, interprets the "primacy" collectively. With Peter here also the apostles are addressed, yes, all believers are meant; "all are Peter and rock, and on all the church of Christ is built".⁵⁸

And like Cyprian and Origen in the 3rd century, Ambrose in the 4th century, likewise more influential than the popes of his time, does not recognize any singular preference for them. The word of the gates of

hell, for many Catholics locus classicus of primacy, Ambrose does not refer to Peter himself, but to his faith. Peter has no primacy anywhere in Ambrose, no prerogatives anywhere, and certainly no successor. Ambrose, whose episcopate competed with the Roman one, made synodal decisions even without, if necessary even against

78 The papal primacy or the "petra scandali".

Rome. With an obvious anti-Roman turn of phrase, the Milanese attested to the primacy of the Apostle Peter, but "the primacy of confession, not of honor (non honoris) j the primacy of faith, not of rank (non ordinis)." Similarly, in the church teacher Athanasius there is "no mention of the rights of Rome, even in the sense of an ecclesiastical arbitration court ... is not mentioned at all" (Hagel). Athanasius concedes the right to call an ecumenical synod to the (Christian) emperor alone. And as far as the church teacher John Chrysostom is concerned, Benedictine Baur, his modern biographer, "nowhere finds the jurisdictional primacy of the pope expressed in clear words".⁵⁹

Like the ecclesiastical luminaries mentioned so far, Basil "the Great" concedes no Roman claim to primacy (in the East). For Basil, who addressed his letters to the West, with one exception, not to the Roman bishop Damasus, but always to all the chief shepherds of the Occident or to those of Italy and Gaul, the clerical hierarchy is a community of equals, Antioch, which boasted the "Cathedra Petri", is ecclesiastically the head of the world and head of the Church Christ alone - another, a visible head of the same, was never recognized by the Eastern Church! To them the bishop of Rome was considered only as the first of the Western episcopate. Isolated appeals of Eastern prelates to him do not mean much. And when Pope Damasus demanded from the Orientals the unconditional acceptance of a Roman formula of faith, Basil firmly rejected it. (Basil's friend and colleague, bishop and church teacher Gregory of Nazianzus, spoke of the "rough wind of the West" and called the Christian West "the foreign.")⁶⁰

Church teacher Jerome admittedly (as a Roman) often devoutly adopts Rome's decisions, especially since he himself hoped to become pope. But he can also confess the general view of his time and call the episcopate, however distinguished by size, by wealth of seats, the same everywhere. Wherever, he writes, there is a bishop, in Rome or

The whole ancient Church knew no honorary or legal primacy ⁷⁹

Gubbio, Constantinople or Rhegium, in Alexandria or Tanis, "he means the same thing, has the same office." ⁶¹

Even Augustine, already quite Romanist after all and at times awkwardly navigating between the pope and his African brethren, does not represent a papal primacy of doctrine and jurisdiction. Without directly attacking the Roman doctrine of Peter, for Augustine the primacy of Peter, as once for Cyprian, was only a personal rank, indeed, instead of the "solus Petrus" for him the "Universa ecclesia" functions as the holder of the key power. Not Peter, the head of the apostles, not the Roman cathedra, not the Roman authority stands for him in the highest place and is authoritative for doctrine, discipline and custom of Christianity, but the authority of the universal church - for which Peter is the symbol according to Mt 16,17 ff. The plenary council is superior to the Roman bishop. Thus, even the First Vatican Council in 1870 had to accuse even the most famous Doctor of the Church of "wrong opinions" (pravae sententiae)! "Sumus christiani, non petriani" (We are Christians, not Petrians), Augustin had declared (Enarr. in psalm. 44,2,3) and Mt. 16,18 "at no time of his life understood and interpreted in the Roman sense" (Caspar). And hardly coincidentally, even Augustine's disciple Orosius - widely read and excessively admired in the Middle Ages - does not ascribe a central position to the Roman bishop, but at best a spiritual primacy.⁶²

This attitude of the most celebrated Catholics of antiquity, however, is all the more remarkable since the writings of the "holy fathers," according to St. Cyril (who may have been thinking not least of his

own products), "came into being by inspiration of the Holy Spirit".⁶³

80 The Papal Primacy or the "petra scandali"

Like bishops and church fathers, the ancient councils also knew

THE ANCIENT COUNCILS DID NOT KNOW THE LEGAL PRIMACY OF ROME.

Since the middle of the 2nd century, the Church has held synods, called synodus or concilium, first particular councils,

provincial synods, apparently modeled on the state provincial assemblies; then also interprovincial synods, plenary councils, as in the Egyptian, Antiochian, African, Italian Churches; finally, meetings of the "universal Church," general or ecumenical councils. So far, one counts 21 of such "ecumenical" meetings (often made only afterwards) in Catholicism, for which there are no always constant characteristics. (The sources use – as do we – the terms council and synod as synonyms.)⁶⁴

However important ecumenical church meetings are to Catholics, even the first "general" councils nowhere decree a primacy of Rome. And, of course, these meetings did not have their decisions confirmed by any "pope" who did not yet exist! Sometimes they communicated their decrees to the Roman bishop, but only like others. Thus the Synod of Arles – meeting anno 314 "with the Holy Spirit and his angels (angelis eius)" – communicated to the bishop Silvester of Rome "what we have decreed by common resolution, so that all may know what to observe in the future" – but not so that the Roman bishop would approve it! So that he may confirm it! So that he decides! Nobody thought of that. Disputes were not settled by popes at that time, but by synods. "For it is impossible to solve the great problems otherwise than through synods," wrote Bishop Euseb of Caesarea. Similarly, Bishop Epiphanius believed, "Councils create certainty (asphāleia) in the questions that arise from time to time."⁶⁵

Indeed, all the great church gatherings of antiquity were not convened by the pope (whose legates were occasionally absent even from "ecumenical" councils: in Constantinople in 381 and 553), but by the emperor. In this respect he had all

The ancient councils knew no legal primacy of Rome ⁸¹

Rights, the pope had none. The emperor set the date, the more precise circle of participants, the subject of deliberation. He opened, presided over, and confirmed these conferences; he gave them the force of law. He also had the right to terminate, adjourn and postpone them. He could be represented by high officials, could also have bishops who did not appear punished. No council, no pope at that time disputed these rights. Even such a self-confident pontiff as Leo I asked Emperor Theodosius II to "order" a synod. Thus, towards the middle of the 5th century, church historian Socrates, generally respected as one of the most honest of the ancient world, can state without any exaggeration: "Since the emperors began to be Christians, the affairs of the church depended on them, and the greatest councils were and are held at their pleasure". Of course, the regents did not recognize the popes as having primacy either. Only in the later 4th century does Gratian concede a kind of jurisdictional primacy to the Roman See holder, but merely over the bishops of the West. And Damasus (since 378) is the supreme court only over the metropolitans, not yet over the suffragans, for whom local courts are responsible.⁶⁶

Of course, at that time a turning point becomes clear, a new doctrine, a new conception emerges, according to which the bishop of Rome is the leader of the whole church, has power over all Christians. This tendency, with a first climax with Leo I, was already developed by the popes Damasus (under whom in 382 a synod in Rome spoke for the first time of the "primacy of the Roman Church", no longer as before of the "primacy of Peter") and Siricius, who admonished, instructed, commanded, threatened in all directions – "decernimus", "iudicamus", "pronuntiamus", "we determine", "we judge", "we decree". In a very short time, such phrases became rampant in the vocabulary of the papal

chancery, whose decretals imitated imperial legal patterns and differed in nothing from the imperial decrees. However, even Damasus and Siricius do not claim command authority over a council. Even Anastasius I (399–401) considers himself merely the head of the Occident. And for the Eastern Church, the pope is also

8z The papal primacy or the "petra scandali"

in the 6th century only the patriarch of the West. Even then, no decisive missionary activity emanates from Rome. "All attempts to ascribe a leading role in Christian missionary work to the papacy before Gregory the Great do not stand up to the statements of the sources" (Catholic Baus). In contrast, the seat of Constantinople is now increasingly called "apostolic". Since the 7th century, the founding legend of Andrew, the apostle of the city, has been interpreted there in an anti-Roman way, especially since, according to John 1:40 f, Jesus called him earlier than Peter. In the 9th century, the greatest Byzantine patriarch, Photios, plays off the older and "first-called" apostle Andrew against Rome's claim to supremacy and its first "pope." "For many years earlier he took the episcopal see of Byzantium when his brother became bishop of the Romans." 67

However, even in the West, the Roman hierarchs' imperious airs that flared up in the later 4th century, their restless ambition to be superiors of all bishops, were widely met with opposition. "Thus the bishop of Parma," the Roman synod meeting under Pope Damasus reported Urbanus as saying in 378, "though deposed by our tribunal, retains his church in his hands without shame, Florentius of Pu-teoli.... sneaked back into his city after six years, occupying the church and stirring up unrest." 68

Especially in important episcopal residences, people liked to ignore Rome: in Carthage, Vienne, Narbonne, or Marseille, where, for example, the respected Proculus, praised by Jerome as holy and highly learned, exercised the metropolitan rights granted to him by a Turin synod, unconcerned by Roman protests. Even after his deposition, with explicit reference to the Turin Council, he continued to consecrate bishops—"with insolence beyond the usual," "with an iron brow and forgetting all shame," as Pope Zosimus was incensed, berating Proculus' "Turin privileges" as "insolently obtained." Proculus, however, followed the citation to Rome as little as the Metropolitan Simplicius of Vienne, whom Zosimus

The ancient councils knew no legal primacy of Rome 83

also accused "insolence" without being able to settle the dispute with the Gallic chief shepherds, including Lazarus of Aix, whom he particularly hated, and the bishops Tuentius and Ursus. The Roman had increased authority over the Italian Church, but was by no means yet in charge of the entire Occident. Milan competed with Rome. Western synods still consulted the hierarchs of Rome and Milan at the same time on important occasions around the turn of the 5th century, as did the Council of Carthage in 397. Or, like the Synod of Toledo (400), a decision was postponed until "the present pope. ..., the bishop of Milan, and the other priests of the churches" wrote on it. From Gaul and Illyria one turned at times apparently more to Milan than to Rome. In any case, the relationship between the two was "a collegial coexistence". The "apostolic" see probably had the greater prestige, but the Roman bishop "had no exceptional legal position". And the "councils stood independently and on an equal footing with the papacy" (Wojtowytsh). Yes, they were "not only the most distinguished legal sources of the church, but also, next to the Bible, the most distinguished source of faith" (H.-G. Beck). 69 Opposition to Rome is sometimes particularly sharp in Africa, where there are some 470 episcopal sees in the early 5th century.

An entire national synod at that time denies the Roman pontifex maximus the possibility to decide correctly and denies at all that his judgment stands higher. Brusquely, the North African church leaders reject any claim of a commanding power over them, do not grant Rome any supreme judicial authority in matters of faith and discipline. The prelates are sure that they can recognize the right doctrine

themselves. Only the Wandalen invasion, the regiment of Arian "heretics" in Africa, caused there a close cooperation of the Catholics with the Roman bishop, from whom the synods of Carthage and Mileve (416,417) requested the confirmation of their decrees. After all, the Visigothic invasion of Spain also led to a more intensive contact with the Romans.

84 The Papal Primacy or the "petra scandali

of the Spanish church to Rome. But still the Council of Carthage in May 418 again threatened excommunication for "transmarine" appeals, in renewal of an old canon law principle.⁷⁰

How un-Romanized the Africans in particular were is taught by an incident whose forensic treatment spans several pontificates of the early 5th century.

The Apiarius Affair

Bishop Urbanus of Sicca, a disciple of Augustine, had excommunicated the presbyter Apiarius because of his scandalous lifestyle ("outrageous shameful deeds") and Apiarius, bypassing his metropolitan, appealed to Rome. The African episcopate, however, had already forbidden priests to appeal to Rome in 393, and in May 418 a Carthaginian general synod forbade any appeal to a "court beyond the sea" (ad transmarina). Pope Zosimus, however, took sides with the fired priest and ordered his bishop, ignoring his superiors, to come to him for vindication. However, since the Roman fell on deaf ears, he sent, as if it were his representation at an imperial council, a delegation of three, subordinate to Bishop Faustinus of Potenza, who, as instructed, referred to canons of Nicaea, but which were in fact those of Serdica. Moreover, the verbatim statutes contradicted papal procedure, since, while they allowed a defrocked presbyter or deacon to appeal to neighboring bishops, they did not contain a word about an appeal to Rome, let alone a right of Rome to intervene in such cases.⁷¹

The Africans reacted with reserve. They did leave Apiarius in office, asking forgiveness for all "errors," but no longer in Sicca, but in Thabraca. And with regard to the "Nicaenian" appeal regulations they were mistrustful.

The Apiarius Affair 85

mistrustful. They would have yielded to them-but not to the "pope!" -significantly at once, but admittedly did not find them in their Nicaea copies and therefore wanted to consult the churches of Constantinople and Alexandria. The papal legate Faustinus repeatedly tried to prevent this, but in vain.⁷²

Meanwhile, Zosimus had died and Boniface I was at the helm. The African episcopate reprimanded the behavior of his predecessor and wrote that if the Statutes of Appeal had been observed in Italy as well, "we would in no way be forced to tolerate such things, which we no longer wish to recall, or would not be subjected to intolerable things. But we believe ... that while Your Holiness presides over the Roman Church, we will no longer experience this haughty treatment and that what must be respected toward us will be respected even without detailed discussion." Clear tones. At the same time, under the presidency of Aurelius of Carthage, the Council of 419, in which Augustine also participated, renewed that decree of the General Council of the previous year which forbade any cleric up to the level of priest to appeal to extra-African authorities, thus also to the Pope, and this expressly now under threat of excommunication. Soon after, the requested acts of Nicaea arrived from Constantinople and Alexandria, which, as expected, refuted Zosimus and were sent on to Rome, where, meanwhile, the Serdi-Censian canon of appeal continued to be pronounced Nicaenian!⁷³

Incidentally, the case of Apiarius was repeated 4x4 under Pope Coelestine. He relapsed, was expelled again, appealed again to Rome, where now the new pope took kindly to him and once again sent Faustinus of Potenza, who this time debated for three days even more unhappily and unsuccessfully, haughtily and insultingly, as the council fathers complained to Coelestine in their epistle "Optaremus". His protégé, however, collapsed under the evidence, accepted the synodal verdict, and the papal legate's

fiasco was complete. "As for our brother Faustinus",
86 the papal primacy or "petra scandali," the synodals wrote, "we hold ourselves assured by Your Holiness's lawful and moderate sense that, without prejudice to brotherly love, Africa will henceforth be entirely spared from him. "7*

But Coelestine also received a rebuff, as no Roman bishop from Africa has ever received. "For that men should be sent from your side," replied the Carthaginian Council, "we did not at all find established (in nullo) by a synod of the Fathers; that, namely, which you have recently established by the same Faustinus.... as it were, as part of the Nicene Council, we could not find such a thing in the more credible codices which are recognized as Nicene ... not to be found." The bishops also did not want to see any more clerics of the pope as executors, "so as not to open the door to the evil-smoking arrogance of the world (fumosum tyfum saeculi). "75

The African episcopate was unusually uncompromising in forbidding papal encroachments on its judicial system. It denied Rome the right to accept further appointments of priests from its country and, on principle, declared each synod solely responsible for the correctness of its decisions. "Surely there will be no one who believes that our God can give any (individual) just sense for judgment, but deny it to the bishops assembled in the greatest number for a council!"76

Thus, even in the early 5th century, the Roman bishop was not considered the decisive supreme authority for the largest Western church, neither in matters of faith, ecclesiastical discipline, nor, as the Apiarius affair in particular drastically shows, jurisdiction. Rather, the African councils in particular considered themselves to be quite authorized to decide for themselves without doubt in all these areas. It is not without reason that papal historian Erich Caspar is convinced that the powerful African Church would never have been bent by the Roman See and the new papal theory of primacy and the idea of subordination, had it not been for the Wandalic invasion that cut its lifeblood and Islam that put an end to it in the 7th century.

The denial of papal primacy 87

made. Catastrophes of others were – until today! – almost, always fortunate for Rome. And Caspar rightly calls the fiasco of the mighty African Church an "unheard-of favor of destiny" for papal history, since this debacle freed the popes from the only serious rival in the West at the crucial times of their rise to supremacy. "Like a giant tree of the jungle struck by lightning, the Carthaginian primacy sank to the ground at a blow and gave way to the Roman one. "77

The contestation of papal primacy

CONTINUED INTO MODERN TIMES

Even in the first early medieval centuries, ecumenical councils by no means bowed to Rome's claim to sole representation. Decisions were made collegially, and the pope was not mentioned at all during the solemn proclamation of the canons. It was not he who was the hierarchical supreme authority with authority to issue orders, it was not he who was competent to make an absolutely binding decision in matters of faith, but the Council. The Roman theologian Wilhelm de Vries sums up at the end of his study on the synods of the first millennium: "According to these councils it is at least the normal thing that decisions in matters of faith and in important disciplinary matters are made collegially. It is difficult to see how a primacy understood in absolutist terms can find support in the tradition of the first millennium. "78

But even in the 2nd millennium, this primacy, which had been achieved so dishonestly as well as with power, continued to be fought. By the Greek Church, of course, by many "heretics", the Cathars, for example, Albigensians, Waldensians, Fraticelli. In the early 14th century by Marsilius of Padua and John of Janduno, the latter a professor at Paris University. Finally by John Wyclif, Hus, Luther along with the rest of the Reformers.

But the resistance of Catholics also continued. Thus, at various church assemblies, attempts were made to limit or completely abolish Roman ambitions of power in favor of the bishops; in Pisa, for example, in Constance (where the council declared itself to be above the pope in the decree "Haec sancta synodus" of April 6, 1415) or in Basel (where the view that the general council was above the pope was elevated to dogma on May 16, 1439). Also, in those times, papal infallibility in matters of faith was disputed and the right to depose the pope in cases of abuse of office or incapacity was demanded. This also includes the "Declaration of the French Clergy" (*declaratio cleri Gallicani*) of 1682, the "Gallicanism" that spread in Germany under the name of "Febronianism" (after Justinus Febronius, whose real name was Johann Nikolaus von Hontheim, auxiliary bishop of Trier, but who recanted in 1778).⁷

The view that only the totality of bishops (episcopalism), not the Roman bishop alone (curialism), represented the unity of the Church, continued to have an effect in the Catholic clergy for a long time, even in modern times, when Leo X condemned it as heresy in 1516 – a pope, by the way, who was already a cardinal at the age of fourteen, also made three of his cousins cardinals, among them the illegitimate Giulio, the later Clement VII. Not to forget also that under Pope Leo, the "Sun God", the number of venal ecclesiastical offices rose to two thousand two hundred! *Auri sacra fames*. Yes, episcopalism quite actually culminated in the 17th and 18th centuries. In the 19th, however, the First Vatican Council dealt it a death blow with the definition of universal papal episcopacy and papal infallibility.

. In the 20th century, however – "for everywhere the Church preaches the truth," as St. Irenaeus teaches – Catholic apologists would have us believe that already at the time of "Constantine's conversion," that is, in the early 4th century, indeed, as follows from the quotation, even much earlier, "the existence of the papacy, i.e., the ruling position of the Roman bishop, had long since been a fully realized and established fact.

The denial of the papal primacy 89

fact" (Meffert); that the bishops of Rome, according to "Mit ober-hirtlicher Druckgenehmigung" Domkapitular Joseph Schieller, "have always exercised the primacy"; that they, according to, likewise church-sanctioned, Nazi theologian Lortz, "always laid claim to the primacy of Rome over all churches"; that the primitive power of the popes, so – with imprimatur – Alois Knöpfler, once Privy Court Councillor, Archbishop's Spiritual Councilor and church historian at the University of Munich, in antiquity "was not merely recognized by the universal church in innumerable [I] spontaneous statements, but not infrequently downright challenged. . that the Roman bishop was always [!] regarded and honored as the head of the church, endowed with higher, divine authority"; that also the testimonies "of the holy fathers," as the apologists Thomas Specht and Georg Lorenz Bauer assert, "unanimously teach that the bishop of Rome or the Roman church possesses primacy." In short, almost the entire Roman Catholic theology asserts until deep into the 20th century (and for the most part still asserts it today): "The primacy of the Roman Pontiff was unanimously recognized by the Fathers of the Church and the Church assemblies of all centuries" (F. J. Koch/Siebengartner) – a blatant lie.⁸⁰ It is a fact, however, that the "Nota Praevia" attached to the Constitution on the Church of Vatican II (on the instruction of a "higher authority") grants the pope a power which, at least verbally, goes far beyond that of Vatican I, since it allows him to exercise "his authority at any time as he sees fit (*ad placitum*). Thus, in 1967, Paul

VI could also be fully aware "that the Pope is the greatest obstacle on the way to ecumenism" – and two years later proudly claim: "We are Peter".⁸¹

Even in ancient times, however, the Roman influence on the more important Church of the East was extremely small and therefore hardly worthy of attention until now. The Oriental synods did not even

know the later concept of the papacy – where from? At the great Council of Nicaea in 325 (I 362 ff) the "pope" was neither present nor had any weight. After the Synod of Tyre

90 The papal primacy or the "petra scandali"

(335), he claimed no special rights for his cathedra. At the Council of Serdica (342 or 343), the attempt to make him the appellate authority in ecclesiastical disputes failed. On the contrary. The Oriental bishops not only turned against St. "Athanasius and the other criminals," but also excommunicated "Julius from the city of Rome, as an instigator and leader to evil." It was not Julius I (337–352) but Athanasius (I ch. 8) who was the leading man of orthodoxy.⁸²

But if the papacy was never able to subjugate the Oriental churches, it was still able to cope more easily with the opposition in the West in antiquity. For not although, but precisely because the Roman bishops did not stand out theologically for a long time as others of the West, Hosius of Cordova, for example, Lucifer of Cagliari, Hilarius of Poitiers, precisely because they devoted themselves much less to theology than to violence, they gradually – decisively promoted by their throneos in the (old) imperial capital, favored by its importance, wealth, splendor – took away from all other great occidental episcopal sees their original independence: Milan (repeatedly Ambrose, not the "Pope", is named first among the "bishops of Italy"), Aquileia, Lyon, Toledo, Braga; with which Italy, Gaul, Spain, Portugal, yes, even Scotland and Ireland became in bondage to the Roman hierarchs. And with the debacle of the Roman Empire their occidental position of power grew even more, which they underpinned ever more effectively by the theology of Peter. Finally, the Roman Church virtually inherited the (Western) Roman Empire, ecclesiasticalized it, took its place, so to speak.⁸³

This increase in Rome's power, at the expense of the western metropolitans and the councils, since time immemorial the highest church authority, was not won without a fight.

This is already shown by the considerably older case of the two Spanish bishops Basilides and Martialis, handed down by Cyprian and clearly reminiscent of the Apiarius affair. Having fallen away during the persecution, they were deposed from their sees, whereupon

The denial of papal primacy 91

they appealed to Rome – the first known occurrence of its kind – and Bishop Stephen issued instructions to reinstate them to their offices. The Spanish communities, however, refused, reported to Africa, and were vindicated by a synod there. They were specifically encouraged not to associate "with godless and defiled priests" and to ignore the Roman bishop's error.⁸⁴

Rome's struggle for power is also shown by the "Easter Controversy" of Victor I (189–198?), whereby the Roman declared, to the indignation of St. Irenaeus, that no one could be a Catholic Christian who celebrated Easter on a day other than Rome—which celebrated Easter on the Sunday after the 14th of Nisan of the Jews (= first full moon after the vernal equinox), but not long ago, as Irenaeus knew, had not celebrated the feast annually at all! Many bishops attacked at that time, so church historian Euseb, the Roman bishop "violently". This struggle is further illustrated by the "heretic dispute" of Stephen with the Africans in the middle of the 3rd century (p. 75). And immediately following, the "Controversy of Dionysius," a trinity-theological dispute between the Roman bishop Dionysius (259–268) and his renowned Alexandrian namesake, who espoused subordinatianism, with the concept of the consubstantiality of Father and Son appearing for the first time (I 352 ff).⁸⁵

For all the authority of the Roman pontiff, his power was limited throughout this period, in the 2nd and 3rd centuries. For all the importance he already had, he did not possess any supreme authority of jurisdiction and decision, neither the practice nor the thought of contemporaries knew a papacy in the later sense. And essentially it remained so until the last decades of the 4th century.⁸⁶

Of course, as the Roman See grew in importance, there were also ever greater struggles over it itself through entire eras. Already coveted during the persecutions of Christians (most of which were

blatantly exaggerated)–even though the bishops of Rome resided side by side, so to speak, with their imperial persecutors--Rome's papal primacy was the most important of all.

92 The papal primacy or the "petra scandali"! But the rivalries begin early, schismatic congregations are soon the rule, sometimes they quarrel in such a way that streets and churches drip with blood – and all for the sake of Christ ...

3- CHAPTER

FIRST RIVALRIES AND TUMULTS FOR THE ROMAN EPISCOPAL SEE

"When the bishop of Hippo closed his eyes in the Vandal storm in 430..the spell of splendor and power already lay on the chair of Peter. Donations of rich lords allow the lords of Rome to deny the simplicity of the fisherman of Capharnaum. The seriousness of the pious takes offense at their pomp and table. Not the noblest passions divide voters into parties." Catholic theologian Joseph Bernhart¹

"With an often astonishing unconcern, the successors of Peter surround themselves in the Roman episcopal chair – with the pageantry of the world.... Thus arises a manifestation of the office of Peter which, for instance, in its monarchical form resembles in some respects the ancient emperorship more than the biblical image of Peter." Catholic theologian Peter Stockmeier²

"One can compile from numerous letters of Jerome a description of the manners of Christian Rome which is like a satire...; and even this historian, who is not hostile to Christians, has already rebuked the luxury and ambition of the Roman bishops. It is on the occasion of the bloody struggle between Damasus and Ursicinus for the episcopal see of Rome where the famous passage is found: <"When I consider the splendor of urban things, I realize that those men, eager to achieve their desires, had to dispute one another with all party violence; for if they attained their goal, they could be sure of becoming rich from the gifts of matrons, of riding high in chariots, of dressing with splendor, and of having meals so indulgent that their tables surpassed those of princes. >" Ferdinand Gregorovius³

There are antipopes in Catholicism, so eager was the high clergy for the "Holy See", through thirteen centuries, until the end of the Middle Ages. The first antipapa – the word does not come into use until the 14th century (instead of the older pseudopapa, anti-christus, schismaticus) – appears in the early 3rd century; the last, Felix V, in the 15th century. (According to some, Felix was the

Counter-popes are princes of the church who demonize their own church; not always, of course. Felix V, for example, the widowed, very rich Duke Amadeus VIII of Savoy, made antipapa* at the Council of Basel in 1439, finally received an honorable farewell, the title "Cardinal of Sabina," the first rank in the so-called Sacred College of Cardinals, and, although anything but poor, for he who has shall be added to, still a lifelong pension. Yes, sometimes an antipapa even becomes a saint – and the (real) papa too. In this church (almost) nothing is impossible.⁵

The struggle of St. Hippolytus against St. Callisto

Immediately the first antipope climbed the honor of the altars. He became a saint of the Roman and Greek Church (Fest:

Battle of St. Hippolytus against St. Callist 95

Greek-writing author of the West, whose extensive literary activity stands completely singular there in the 3rd century. He was the first learned prelate of Rome, which is probably why the more demanding part of the Christians, a schismatic minority, exalted him. He repeatedly calls himself bishop of Rome, his predecessor, St. Zephyrin, a philistine and ignorant.⁶

Hippolytus' competitor Kallist (217–222) is also canonized (Fest:

Hippolytus now, whose Catholic views are later considered orthodox, sought to morally destroy his rival in a vita Callisti, derisively titled "The Martyrdom of Callistus under the praefectus Urbi Fuscianus."

The Christian-educated Callistus, a slave from the port district, son presumably of a slave Callistrate

and once, according to Hippolytus, also a robber chief, began his career as a banker, so to speak. For the rich Christian Carpophorus, a member of the imperial court, he managed. in the piscina publica, at the fish market, a bank to which the Roman Christian believers made large deposits. But Kallist (a former predecessor, as it were, of the Vatican bank chief and mafia associate Archbishop Marcinkus) speculates with his master's money, that of numerous Christian widows and brothers, and "gets away with it all."

0 First rivalries and tumults

Bankrupt in 187/88, he flees on a ship to Porto, plunges into the sea, pursued by Carpophorus, but is fished up, brought back to Rome and sentenced to the treadmill. There he swindles his way out and soon quarrels with Jews over (alleged) outstanding debts. Thus, on the Sabbath, a tumult ensues in the synagogue. The Jews beat up Kallist and drag him to the city prefect, where he confesses to be a Christian. But Carpophorus, who has rushed over, declares: "Do not believe this one; he is not a Christian, but only owes a lot of embezzled money, as I will prove". City prefect Fuscianus has Callist flogged and orders his deportation ad metalla, to the mines of Sardinia, the island of death. Here, however, an intervention

of Emperor Commodus' Christian mistress Marcia saves him, and the Roman bishop Viktor brings him for about ten years in safety to Antium, one of the most popular villeggiaturas of the noble Rome including the imperial house; in addition - what dazzling light falls here on the "bankruptcy" of the banker - still a monthly pension, which makes Kallist "all honor" (Cardinal Hergenrother), the older literature even calls banishment; he is considered in all seriousness in the church as a confessor. With Viktor's successor Bishop Zephyrin (199-217) - "an unlearned and uneducated man, who did not know the ecclesiastical ordinances, was open to gifts and greedy for money" (Bishop Hippolytus) - Kallist gains more and more influence by "his constant presence and his turning of the eyes", his "game of intrigue", he becomes financial advisor of the chief shepherd and, after he has "ruined Zephyrinus" and ousted Hippolytus, himself bishop of Rome. "He was just a swindler and a schemer," Hippolytus writes about St. Callist. He had "poison deep in his heart," "nothing but false opinions," and a timidity "to speak the truth. "8

Is it any wonder that since Callist, the clergy absorbed from Roman civil service law the doctrine of the inviolability of office, which left even the unworthy officeholder with the power of office?! Just Kallist demanded and realized in the West as the first the irremovability of the bishop even in the case of a "death

The struggle of St. Hippolytus against St. Callist 97

sin." And this, although the letter of St. Clement, so appreciated by the Church and even counted as "Holy Scripture" in Syria, calls only the morally blameless irremovable! In the fight against the Shi'ite Donatists one developed then, strictly against the traditional sermon, the laxistic line further to the typically Catholic, unsurpassably cynical, but also every crookedness tolerating consequence, according to which the church (objectively) is always holy, how corrupt also her priests (subjectively) are (1275)'. His opponent's following, St. Hippolytus asserts, grew because he, St. Callist, was the first to permit sins that Christ forbade, sins 'that serve to gratify lusts.' Also, St. Kallist allowed "twice and thrice married bishops, priests and deacons to be ordained".... Yes, he allowed "women of noble status, who were unmarried and addicted to marriage while still young, but did not want to forfeit their rank by a lawful marriage, to have a cohabitant of their choice, be it a slave or a freeman, and to consider him, even without a lawful marriage, as their husband. And so, so-called Christian women began to use contraceptive means and to lace themselves to abort the foetus, because they did not want to have a child by a slave or a common man, because of their high birth and their giant fortune. See how far the nefarious man has come in his ungodliness! He teaches adultery and murder at the same time. And on all this, these shamed ones go to call themselves "Catholic Church" and some run to them, thinking to act

rightly ... This man's teaching spread all over the world".¹⁰

Roman bishops and saints among themselves!

Of course, here two careerists were fighting against each other. Of course, Hippolytus had been panned by hatred and jealousy – the domain of so many clerics. But his injuries might hit the essence. And evident is the discrepancy with the teaching of Jesus: "Whoever looks at a woman even covetously has already committed adultery with her in his heart". Now "Pope" Kallist calls adultery forgivable. Does he allow to make

?8 First rivalries and tumults young women also without marriage a cohabitant after choice! He softens Christian morals without hesitation – and the Christian plebs rally around him with gratitude.¹¹

Even Tertullian, one of the most eloquent "heretics," one of the greatest "Protestants" before Luther, foams and sneers, thunders at Kallist, "yes, who are you to twist and change..." – attacks the decree of the "pontifex maximus," as he mocks him with the pagan title, the "bishop of all bishops," as an "unheard-of innovation" that would have been better published in the brothels. "There should be read of this estate, where one enters with hope. But no! It is to be read in the church." ¹²

Spiritual farsightedness, no doubt, Kallist had shown, had recognized the "actual conditions" (the Catholics Seppelt/Löffler), "the practical necessities" (Protestant Aland), had initiated a development to which the future belonged. In his "edictum perpetuum", if he issued it, almost generally disputed now, he referred to the "apostolic key power": Mt. 16,19. (Of course he did not refer to Mt. 5,27 f.). Also not to Gen. 38,24; Deut. 20,10; Deut. 22,22; 1 Cor. 6,9; Hebr. 13,4 etc. Because everyone always gets what he needs from the Bible). Kallist, of course, made his opportunistic adaptation to daily and mass needs popular. The learned, old-fashioned Hippolytus, on the other hand, author of a famous "Traditio apostolica" (who also forbade soldiers and hunters to kill: I 250, a "rigorist", as clerical circles tend to insult non-lax Christians), represented the traditional doctrine, according to which no priest and bishop could decree apostasy, murder, fornication. Kallist, however, now declared fornication a forgivable sin. After the mass apostasy in the Decian persecution (p. 100 f), when, especially among the more noble, "immediately many" (bishop Euseb) betrayed their faith, the church, eager for masses and power, also forgave apostasy from the faith. And in 314, with the appearance of the first field apostles (1247 ff), murder immediately lost its absolutely exclusive character. Thus – typical for the mostly of the time and the rati

Fight of St. Hippolytus against St. Kallist 99 usually the innovators triumph. Kallist allegedly suffered martyrdom – first mentioned in 354. Later they forged a passio Callisti, a whole novel of martyrdom. The beadles of Alexander Severus plunge Kallist, who had been tracked down during the service, into a well. He is also said to have fallen victim to the lynch law of the people or to have jumped out of the window himself, and this "after a long and agonizing incarceration" (Wetzer/Welte); but he nevertheless preaches, heals, baptizes. In the 12th century the Germans already build horrible representations of his sufferings! And through two millennia the church celebrated him as a martyr – today even its theologians admit the falsification.

The schism continued. Hippolytus held his own even against Urban I (222–230) and Pontianus (230–235). Finally, the "Holy Fathers" quarreled to such an extent that Emperor Maximinus Thrax sent both Hippolytus and Pontianus to Sardinia in 235, where both died – though not in the mines, the "quarries" (Gelmi), where Catholics still like to have Pontianus perish in order to have one more of the exceedingly rare martyr popes. For in the case of honestiores, which already included bishops, the law allowed only deportation (in insulam), not condemnation (ad metalla). Pontianus is said to have renounced his dignity on September 28, 235 – the earliest date of Roman bishop history secured by day and month! After their death, both opponents were brought back at the same time, buried at the same time, but in different places, and celebrated as martyrs. Callist, Pontian and Hippolytus are the oldest

Romans mentioned in the calendar of martyrs, the "calendar of saints" of the Roman community (Depositio Martyrum) of 354.

None of them became martyrs. However, the feast of St. Hippolytus, who became the patron saint of horses, has been celebrated by the Catholic Church on August 13 since the 3rd century. It was the special holiday of the oldest Roman patron goddess Diana, who merged with the Greek Artemis, the goddess of hunting and protector of wild animals. Quickly and completely the legend swallowed Hippolytus' personality, and

too First rivalries and tumults, finally, not a single trait reminded of his historical archetype.¹³

Soon after his death, instead of the Greek world language, which also prevailed in Rome and made the capital, according to Juvenal's complaint, a "Graeca urbs," Latin became the language of the Western Church. And perhaps it is (also) connected with the fact that the versatile, fruitful church author, whose work Ambrose and Jerome still used, fell into oblivion in the West: already Jerome and Euseb did not even know his episcopal see. Hippolytus' successor Damasus I (366–384), in an inscription in honor of the scholar, concealed his episcopal title and spoke only of the presbyter, apparently to erase the memory of the first Roman schism. It was not until 1551 that a marble statue, headless in a philosopher's cloak, was found in the catacombs, probably in Hippolytus' burial chamber, on the bishop's chair, the outer pages of which, though incomplete, cite his writings. The "great unknown" of ecclesiastical literary history for so long thus reappeared in the Occident from obscurity.¹⁴

Cornelius versus Novatian

Not even a generation had passed before there was a new and sharper schism among the Roman bishops Cornelius (251–253) and Novatian, in which again, apart from personal rivalry, the increasingly lax practice of penance played a role.

While the generous Cornelius – a saint, helpful especially against falling sickness and cramps – took back the heaps of Christians who had jumped off after the Decian persecution, which of course ensured him victory, Novatian rejected this brusquely. Against the majority of the Roman Church and against the African Church, he demanded lifelong excommunication for "Lapsi," since the Church had "mortal sins" such as murder, marital

Cornelius contra Novatian too

breach, apostasy – in fact its oldest doctrine!

Novatian was a former professional rhetor, suave, rigorous, an excellent stylist, with a fondness for Virgil and the Stoa. At the time of persecution, he was the leader of the Roman Christian community after the death of Bishop Fabian (236–255), the first "papal" martyr, who was not sentenced to death, but died in prison. Neither Cyprian nor the inscription plate inside his sarcophagus therefore call him a martyr. The old church however gave up to then eleven of seventeen Roman bishops as martyrs! – "... time was lacking for documentations; but no tomb is imagined, no name mythical, and the <Zeugnis still arouses astonishment", writes Frits van der Meer in general. But why should there have been no time for documentation? One found it, nevertheless, also for masses of falsified martyr reports. And doesn't van der Meer already speak on the first page of the "immense legacy of the church fathers"? But no time to document the own blood witnesses and even "martyr" – "popes"?

Novatian had made legitimate hopes for the bishop's seat, also Cyprian of Carthage at first expected his election. Soon, however, the most incredible calumnies circulated about the favorite, especially by Cornelius himself. Inferior in spirit and character, he sneered at his opponent as a "luminary", a "dogmatist and patron of ecclesiastical knowledge", accused him of "insatiable greed", "poisonous snakes", "deviousness and falsehood, perjury and lies". He reviles him a "cunning and cunning", a "wicked", "criminal man," a "deceitful and vicious beast" – animal comparisons are especially popular among quarreling Christians (I 155 ff). Bishop Cornelius reports that Novatian "suddenly, as if hurled

by a gun among the people, appeared as a bishop" by luring "three bishops, crude and simple-minded people, fraudulently" to Rome by fabricated notions. Here he left them, spreading St. Francis.

io2 First rivalries and tumults

Cornelius about his rival, "by some of his gelichter's people, who were employed for the purpose, shut them up, and at four o'clock in the afternoon, when they were intoxicated and reeling, compelled them by force to give him the bishopric by an imaginary and invalid imposition of hands. And this bishopric, which does not belong to him at all, he now claims by intrigue and cunning." 15

Further blaspheming, Cornelius slandered: even before baptism, probably as a catechumen, Novatian had been plagued by evil spirits and treated Christian exorcists; "Satan" had "dwelt in him for a long time." But the "worst folly" of his antipode was that Novatian, even while distributing the Eucharist, implored his followers to be faithful to him. He is said to have grasped the hands of each firmly with the sentence: "Swear to me by the blood and body of our Lord Jesus Christ that you will never leave me and never pass over to Cornelius!" And, instead of responding with Amen at the reception of the bread, one allegedly had to vow, "I will never return to Cornelius." 16

Bishop Cornelius, to whom Cyprian finally exhibits "the most glorious testimony of virtue and faith," also accuses his counter-bishop of "cowardice and greed for life," apostasy during the persecution. ±58 Novatian died as a martyr. The church, however, denied this. Instead, it had Cornelius "beheaded," who in reality, Z53, died a natural death in Centumcellae. "The records," writes the Catholic theologian Ehrhard, "that make Pope Cornelius a martyr are worthless," that is, falsified; hardly disputed today. 17 Cornelius excommunicated Novatian along with his comrades at a synod of sixty bishops in 151; and after an embarrassing hesitation, Cyprian of Carthage (who, incidentally, was himself given a counter-bishop at a small counter-council in Fortunatas in May 252) joined Cornelius and was soon behind his agitation in nothing.

Like Cornelius, Cyprian castigates the "apostates," "the traitors," their "error," "madness," their "subversion," "frenzy." In particular, Novatus the presbyter, one of his chief g-

Cornelius contra Novatian 103 ner who fights Cyprian's consecration as bishop and soon thereafter supports Novatian in Rome, the "cunning villain," the "mad schismatic," becomes a major object of his attacks. "He is a man always addicted to novelty, furious in the greed of his insatiable avarice.... always on the lookout to betray, a flatterer who only wants to deceive ____ A lo-blazing torch he is to fan the fires of indignation, a whirling tempest to bring about the shipwreck of faith, an enemy of tranquility, an opponent of silence, an adversary of peace." The Cyprianic tirades invoke "the orphans he robbed, the widows he defrauded, and also the funds of the Church he disavowed..." "His father also died in the open street, and he did not even have his body buried. His wife he pushed with his foot on the abdomen, causing her premature birth and the death of the child. And now . . ." 18

Enough. Christians upon Christians. Priest upon priest.

The Novatian Church, early pronounced dead, in reality lasted for centuries, indeed, was "in its historical existence the latent admission of the bad conscience of the Great Church, which constantly saw itself compelled to compromise with its environment and also had to feel this" (Andresen). The Novatians were later considered dogmatically orthodox, and were also in complete agreement with the Catholics on the particularly controversial theology of the Trinity. Even Theodosius I fully tolerated them; even more so Emperor Julian. From Spain and Gaul, where Bishop Marcianus of Arelate (Arles) also became a Novatian, to the Orient, there were soon two bishops and two congregations fighting each other in every major city, although their "return" to Catholicism was greatly facilitated. In Constantinople, the Novatians had three churches in the 4th century; Acesius was bishop there under Constantine. Even in Rome, the Novatian schism lasted until the 5th century, with a considerable

following and likewise several churches. In the East (in Syria, Asia Minor, Palestine, etc.), where Novatian was most popular, the sect lasted much longer; also numerous Montanists also joined it here. The Novatians were sometimes called Montanistae and Montenses. They themselves, the "congregation of the saints", also called themselves, "in spiritual arrogance", says Euseb, "katharoi", the "pure ones", because their church was the church "pure" from mortal sins; a name from which the world-historical designation "Cathar" and the German loan word "Ketzer" originate. In the 4th and 5th centuries, Christian emperors usually fought the Novatians for the sake of imperial unity. Honorius and Theodosius II took severe action against them. Popes Innocent I and Coelestine I robbed their churches, so that their bishop Rusticula had to hold services in private houses (-or should I have said of Coelestine, he probably introduced the Introit into the Mass? Cf. 112 f). St. Cyril of Alexandria also took away the churches of the Novatians together with their inventory, and even let the private property of their bishop Theopemptos disappear in his pockets (p. 197). Occasionally their places of worship were even destroyed, as by Bishop Eleusios of Kyzi-kos on the Hellespont. And from the writings, which the philosophically trained Novatian as the first Roman theologian published in Latin, remained probably not by chance little. It is hardly a coincidence that the Novatians were especially attractive to more educated Christians.¹⁹

The only two scholars that Christian Rome had in the 3rd century were antipopes; one, according to Haller, was fought all his life, the other excommunicated.²⁰

The "Marshal of God" and "Patron of Horned Cattle"

Cornelius, however, (often depicted with a drinking horn) not only outran his rival. He became popular. As a legitimate "pope", as a real saint (feast: September 16) and false "martyr" he advanced to one of the so-called four marshals, "court marshals of God", "heavenly trustees", who are generally called upon in plague-like epidemics, but in the Catholic Rhineland also revered as special emergency helpers, as a supplement to the fourteen emergency helpers ("because of their unique merits and daily help": Cologne "Marschall"). daily help": Cologne document of 1479); the hermit Anthony especially in Wesel, Bishop Hubert in the Ardennes, the tribune Quirinus in Neuss, and Cornelius in Selikum, St. Severin (Cologne) or in Kornelimünster near Aachen. The extremely rich Benedictine monastery, secularized in 1802, was destroyed by the Aacheners in 1310, but had to be fully replaced. And even if the veneration of the "four marshals" died out since the Enlightenment, the veneration of the four saints did not. Still in the 20th century, thousands are said to make an annual pilgrimage to Kornelimünster on the feast of St. Cornelius, which even -destination of the pious - contains the "head" of the court marshal a. D., a silver "bust reliquary". (In the late Middle Ages one venerated there as capital pieces among other things also "the cloth with which the Savior girded himself at the Last Supper... and the sweat cloth which was laid on the face of our Lord in the grave": Beissel SJ). Furthermore Cornelius became "patron of the horned cattle", thus probably also of all horned oxen, but is furthermore invoked for convulsions, falling sickness (epilepsy) et cetera; even if St. Valentine is more competent here.²¹

io6 First rivalries and tumults

Turmoil, murder, and wreaths of lies.

The popes Marcellinus, Marcellus, Miltiades, Silvester, et al.

The controversial penitential issue led to disputes in the early 4th century, even under Marcellus I and Eusebius. During Diocletian's persecution, Pope Marcellinus (296 to 304?), like so many Christians, preferred his life to martyrdom. He sacrificed, thurificatus and traditor, to the gods and delivered "hl. Scriptures"; although the historical testimony, after all by Christians, Donatists, did

not remain undoubted. But even Pope Nicholas considered it proven. It is significant enough that even some old papal catalogs do not mention Marcellinus, thus exercising radical justice, the damnatio memoriae - a dark chapter - against the apostate in the persecution.

After the pogrom was over, however, the Christians, one strict, one lax party, each with a bishop, beat each other's heads in. Twice in a row the government intervened. Bishop Marcellus, Bishop Eusebius, Heraclius, the leader of the clerical opposition, had to go into exile. Then, apparently, a double bishopric existed until 335. The counter-bishop was Marcus, a man of special "holiness". But even Pope Damasus I evokes the vehemence of the dispute: "furor, odium, discordia, lites, seditio, caedes, bellum, solvuntur foedera pacis". Thus, still on the epitaph that Damasus put to Marcellus, a sharp rigorist, the latter lives on as "a bitter enemy to all the wretched", is deplored "furious hatred" among Christians, "discord and strife, riot and murder".²²

To the gods Marcellinus is said to have sacrificed along with his three presbyters and successors: popes Marcellus I (308 to 309?), he came only after almost four years of sedis vacancy, the longest in papal history; Miltiades (311–314?) and Sylvester I (314 to 335). But as so often, the tradition is uncertain, confused, even deliberately distorted by euphemistic clerical falsification of records. Yes, it may be that Marcellinus is identical with Marcellus I (the emperor Maxentius, towards Christians in reality Turmoil, Murder and Wreaths of Lies 107 emphatically tolerant: 1218 ff, repeatedly detached to stable services and who, according to legend, is also said to have died in the stable, catabulum, of course as a martyr). The church venerates all three respectively four as saints until today. But even the Liber Pontificalis, the official papal book, calls Marcellinus a traditor (defector) and reports that he offered incense, but lets him die a martyr's death as atonement; on Diocletian's order he is beheaded. The decisive battle of the Milvian Bridge, the Edict of Toleration of Milan and the condemnation of the Donatists took place during the short reign of Miltiades.

The real contemporary of Constantine, however, is Sylvester I – "great as time": papal historian Gröne. In fact, however, the Roman played virtually no role in the emperor's decisions. Although he "reigned" for 22 years, less is known about him than about any other bishop of the 4th century! All the more then knew later Christian fictions and falsifications, to which the popes owe their whole state. From St. Silvester no real letters are preserved. The tradition is literally fabulous. "Richly entwined by a wreath of legends" (Seppelt/Löffler), he heals the leprous emperor, he frees Rome from the poisonous breath of a dragon. And since he is presumably sacrificed to the gods, the Christian tales emphasize his steadfastness in detail. But the governor, who wants to force him to surrender Catholic possessions, chokes on a fish bone. Yes, in the fight with the twelve Jewish masters, Silvester revives a bull killed by the last master. "Your God can kill, but mine can make alive". (And truly: on the high altar of Gregor Ehrhard in Blaubeuren, 1493/94, also on numerous later paintings, the bull lies at Silvester's feet.)²³

io8 First rivalries and tumults

Of all kinds of bloodshed and further blood witnesses.

The Felician Schism

A civil war broke out in Rome in the middle of the 4th century by Liberius (352–366).

We encountered this pope already under Emperor Constantine, when he first preferred to "suffer death for God" rather than agree to things that contradicted the Gospel, but then in exile denied his faith and excommunicated the "orthodox" Athanasius (I 391). The church teachers Athanasius like Jerome testify to this – even if still in the 20th century fundamental theologian Kösters of the Frankfurt Jesuit College St. Georgen (with double ecclesiastical blessing) lies that the pope "certainly did not sign any heretical formula". On the other hand, the Catholic theologian Albert Ehrhard, almost on the same year, but without imprimatur, holds the result of the research: "There is no doubt that Liberius signed the so-called 3rd Sirmian formula. With it he gave up not only the person of Athanasius, but also the keyword of the Nicene <Homousios>"?*

Other Catholics have also long conceded this. Thus, for papal historian Seppelt, it is not only subject to "no doubt" that Liberius "gave his signature to the so-called third Sirmian formula," but that he also

voluntarily accepted and signed the "first Sirmian formula (of 351), which likewise rejected the Homousios." As then it is "certain" for Seppelt "that Liberius revealed the person of Athanasius. "15 When the traitor of the Nicene faith returned to Rome on August 2, 358, (counter-)Pope Felix II (355-358) was ruling there. Liberius had to promise the emperor that he would recognize him as his equal and rule the Roman church together with him - a severe humiliation and impossible under canon law. But only under this condition, for which the synod of Sirmium (358) also advocated, was Of all kinds of bloodshed and other blood witnesses 109

Liberius had been allowed to return. On the other hand, Felix himself, together with the deacon Damasus, later pope, and the entire Roman clergy, had sworn a solemn oath at the time of Liberius' banishment not to recognize anyone else as bishop of Rome during his lifetime. Only months later, however, Felix, supposedly raised by the Arian party on imperial orders, accepted the papacy, readmitted the Arians to the Church, and the Roman clergy joined him. Both the clergy and the new pope became oath-breakers. And even Liberius did not stop his word given to the ruler from falling upon Felix and his weaker following. For the people are said to have remained loyal to the exile, cheering him on his return and shouting, "One God, one emperor, one bishop!" The Felician Schism, the power struggle between two Roman bishops, both of whom had betrayed the "orthodox" confession of Nicaea for the sake of their advantage, led to bloody battles, the so-called Felician Murder. Felix II, standing as a bishop in the official catalog of bishops, was expelled in 358 and went to his country estate near Porto. He later attempted a comeback, still conquering the Basilica Julia across the Tiber, but was soon driven out and died, forgotten for a long time, at Porto on November 22, 365. Pope Liberius, however, who signed a halbarian creed under the Arian emperor Constantius, again persecuted the Arians under the Catholic emperor Valentinian I.²⁶

Nevertheless, official Roman tradition recalled Felix II, eventually even counting him among the rightful popes and saints, while Liberius, even in the last years of his life, no longer played any particular role outside Rome and was morally irredeemably compromised. The oath-breaking Felix, however, since the 6th century, supposedly due to the strange confusion with a martyr Felix on the Via Portuensis or with another of that name venerated on the Via Aurelia, was considered a legitimate pope and holy martyr (feast: July 29).

The official papal book, which admittedly is more than half a year dew
iio First Rivalries and Tumults

send is of little historical value, vouches for his martyrdom. "Felix was a Roman ..he reigned one year, three months, three days. He declared Constantius a heretic, therefore the emperor had him beheaded.... He suffered death in the city of Corona with many priests and faithful in the month of November.... , "27

Since Constantius, who had Pope Felix beheaded, had already died in 361, but Felix only died under the Catholic Emperor Valentinian I in 365, some of his successors seem to have thought about this martyrdom of the (counter)pope. The process of forming an opinion lasted, since Rome can wait, longer than a millennium. But then Gregory XIII (1572-1585) - that "Holy Father" who not only celebrated the mass murders of St. Bartholomew's Night with a Te Deum, but also approved the plan to assassinate the English queen Elizabeth I. (affirmed) - wanted to be the Pope. (affirming "that whoever removes her from the world with the due intention of serving God thereby not only does not sin, but even acquires a merit") - this sensitive pope wanted to delete his early predecessor Felix from the "Roman Book of Tortures" when reviewing it.²⁸ ,

Now, however, miraculous and marvelous things occurred in the church of Sts. Cosmas and Damian, twin brothers and martyrs, built by Felix IV in the 6th century on the ruins of two pagan temples. In 303, together with three other brothers, they lost their heads after being thrown into the sea, saved by an

angel, burned by a fire that was supposed to destroy them, turned by a series of arrows and stones thrown at them, and slain by their henchmen, whereupon they were soon invoked throughout Christianity as patron saints, and became the patrons of doctors, pharmacists, and medical schools. And although in the 20th century even J. P. Kirsch, Apostolic Protonotary and Director of the Pontifical Archaeological Institute, Rome, states with imprimatur: "Genuine historical news about the life and martyrdom of the twin brothers are missing", nevertheless, Catholic Hümmeler, likewise in the 20th century and

Murderer Pope Damasus fights against Counter-Pope Ursinus m

likewise with imprimatur: "since then", since the 6th century, "their veneration has not been extinguished". Rather, as "the only saints of the Oriental Church ... were included in the canon of the Holy Mass". And Kirsch adds: "Their alleged relics came to Bremen in 965, to St. Michael in Munich in 1649 (precious shrine). Feast: September 27, among the Greeks October 27. "2'

As here natural and supernatural, legend, that

is lie, and history (which admittedly often means the same thing) intertwine, so now also with Felix II. For just in the Roman church of these miracle-rich blood witnesses, St. Cosmas and Damian, one found on July 28, 1582, on the eve of the memorial day of (counter-)Pope Felix II, a marble coffin with the "old" inscription: "Here lies the body of the holy pope and blood witness Felix, who condemned the heretic Constantius". On it the name of Felix remained further "in the book of martyrdom".³⁰

Murderer Pope Damasus Fights Counter-Pope Ursinus and Other Devils

With the growing power of the Roman See, the ever-increasing influence, wealth, and luxury of its holders, the priests became more and more eager for that seat, now noticing the increased use of the term "sedes apostolica" and in general a new authoritarian streak toward other churches. A Roman synod in 378 already speaks of bishops threatening other bishops with death, chasing them away, depriving them of their bishopric. The historian Ammianus Marcellinus, a pagan who strives for impartiality and views Christianity rather favorably, who moves from his hometown Antioch to Rome around 380, attributes the fights over the Roman cathedra to the feudal lifestyle of the popes. Around the same time, the highly educated

in First Rivalries and Tumults city prefect Praetextatus, likewise a pagan – as at that time, according to Augustine's testimony, still almost the entire Roman nobility – mockingly acknowledges conversion attempts of Damasus with the sentence: "Make me bishop of Rome, and I will immediately become a Christian". The table of this prince of the church is said to have already eclipsed a royal banquet. "The poor country clergy, however, comes to Rome once in a while to get drunk unseen" (C. Schneider)?¹

In the Catholic pope historian V. Gröne, who here represents distortionists and whitewashers in a shocking way, all this reads like this: "At the time when Damasus took over the pontificate, the papacy had reached such a high reputation also worldly that he already had to renounce the poverty of the apostles in the outward appearance because of the position he held towards the emperor and the highest state officials and had to limit himself to practicing it only in the spirit for the good of the common church. The highest bishop of the church was forced to surround himself with worldly splendor and to go to great lengths in clothing, housing, and hospitality in order to represent the church with its precious libraries, its golden vessels, purple vestments, and magnificent altars in a manner worthy of the world. As Peter had to come to Rome with a pilgrim's staff to conquer the luxuriant, rich, oversaturated, so his successor, with the turn of the years, had to make of the wooden staff a golden one and to clothe the feet with purple sandals to protect and preserve the torn, plundered, abandoned".³²

Especially under Damasus I (366–384), servant of the Most High since his youth and called

"Matronarum auriscalpius" because of his beautiful speeches, especially those that stimulated women, there were fiercer battles than ever before, intrigues, slander and financial dealings so sinister that they

already remind researchers of Renaissance popes. This first somewhat outstanding, but difficult to see through, then about sixty-year-old "deputy" already very clearly recognized the attraction of power and ruled longer

Murderer Pope Damasus fights Counter-Pope Ursinus 113

than any of his predecessors, eighteen years. "Beyond human measure," Ammian writes, he, Damasus, and his opponent Ursinus burned to "seize the episcopal see." Through terror and bribery, Damasus finally triumphed, first swearing allegiance to Pope Liberius, who had made him a deacon, but then, under antipope Felix to Felix defeated and after Liberius returned to Liberius.³³

No sooner had the funeral ceremonies for the latter ended on September 24, 366, than part of the clergy elevated the deacon Ursinus as his successor and had him immediately consecrated in the Basilica of Julius (S. Maria di Trastevere) by the bishop of Tivoli. Meanwhile, the greater part of the clergy was still engaged in S. Lorenzo in Lucina with the election of the priest's son Damasus, who, by the way, now again left the party of Liberius and led that of the defeated (counter-)pope Felix to victory (his third change, after all): Prelude to months of riot scenes in "holy" Rome, in the "capital of piety" (cf.

Sozomenos). There were real battles in the streets and squares, the basilicas were swimming in blood. For Damasus, the whole Catholic Church was "a single nuptial chamber of Christ", but the Roman Church was something special, "superior to the other churches... by the word of our Lord and Savior in the Gospel, who gave it primacy, saying: <You are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church ".

Damasus did not forget to remember, in addition, St. Paul, who "on the same day with Peter gloriously obtained the crown of martyrdom under the Emperor Nero", and by this double "venerable triumph" the Church of Rome was "placed before all the other cities of the whole world". So it is that the first see of the Apostle Peter is the Roman one, which has no stain or wrinkle nor anything of that kind . . .³⁴

Thus in 382. What now follows happened already in 366 at the papal election, after which Damasus "continued the policy of conciliation begun by Liberius" (Catholic Seppelt).

First, a horde armed with clubs rushed at

ii4 First rivalries and tumults

the followers of Ursinus still gathered in the church, to which, it is said, Damasus had incited and won the crowd by abundant money. For three days the Catholics again fought bloodily for the basilica of St. Julius, which had already been fought over under Liberius (p. 109). Then Damasus, who was hiding in the Lateran with a bodyguard, had all the clerics of his opponent hauled away by police officers and threw them out of office. However, a pack of people snatched them away and entrenched themselves with them on the Esquiline in the Basilica Liberiana (Santa Maria Maggiore). On October 16, 366, these stormed the papal beating force, a mob of carters, circus men, gravediggers, whom the highly wealthy pontiff had engaged as private mercenaries, broke down the gates, forced their way in, set fires, and bombarded the shut-ins from above with roof tiles. For Damasus, "this God-loving and art-loving priest," "a very great character," "freed the strength of primitive Christianity, so long stored up for battle, for construction" (Hümmeler, with church printing permission). At least 137 men and women, all followers of Ursinus, breathed their last at that time "for the construction" at the holy place; according to an Ursiani report even 160 people - not counted in each case the severely wounded who still succumbed to their wounds, altogether hundreds of victims, wounded, burned. But, a sheer miracle of God, not a single henchman of Damasus perished, whose "childlike-pious sense" is also highly praised by the old Catholic "Kirchen=Lexikon" of Wetzer/Welte (a twelve-volume, (a twelve-volume "Encyclopedia" written "with the collaboration of the most excellent Catholic scholars of Germany", on the first page of which - for the sake of the humility always preached there, I find it difficult to suppress - the head pastor of Freiburg in 1847 thus grants "Our approval" and allows "it to be preprinted": "We Hermann von Vicari, by God's mercy and the grace of the Apostolic See Archbishop of Freiburg and

Metropolitan of the Upper Rhine Church Province, Grand Cross of the Order of the Lion of Zähringen, holder of the Princely Hohenzollern=Hechingen'schen and Hohenzollern=Sigmaringen'-Murderer Pope Damasus fights against Counter-Pope Ursinus 115 see Cross of Honor I. Classe..." - so, indeed, "We grant this first volume Our approbation ...").

City prefect Viventius, "integer et prudens Pannonius", as Ammian says, was undoubtedly an efficient man, but without sufficient means of power. Thus, respecting the motto of non-interference in sacred disputes, he first enjoyed the spectacle as a spectator, then retreated to the peace and security of his landyilla, the Ursians held funeral litanies, and the crowd, apparently remembering Damasus' leading role already in the Felician murders, shouted, "For the fifth time already Damasus makes war, down from the chair of Peter with the murderers!" Various pamphlets also circulated. An Ursiani party leaflet praised the God-fearing people "who, though tormented by many persecutions, fear neither emperor nor officials, nor the author of all crimes, the murderer Damasus." Not to forget that this pope was also behind the "blood edicts" of Emperor Theodosius to hunt down the Christians who apostatized from him, Damasus, whom the state itself supported with all means of violence.³⁵

Of course, the papal mass murderer became a saint. Feast: December 11. And, as it were, for the sake of constant remembrance, for the sake of zeal here, for the sake of deterrence there, the Damasus Court, the representative court of the papal palace, was named after him. I always remember Claude Adrien Helvetius (1715-1771): "If you read their legends of saints, you will find the names of a thousand canonized criminals" - an accommodating understatement of the great Enlightenment philosopher. (And if I may be allowed to express a personal preference: of all the saints, I alone like the holy cows; but all the other cows count just as much to me.)³⁶

Damasus, having conquered the little ship of Peter with the help of the government, now had to steer it with the rudder of the apostle, "which we have received." He hypocritically confessed that he was "not worthy of this honor," but he made "every effort to see if we cannot attain the glory of his blessedness." Even though the main battle

had been fought, his bishopric was not conquered during the first years.

ⁿ⁶ First rivalries and turmoil throughout his tenure. For years there were still turmoils, acts of violence, tortures of clerics of the antipope. The Luciferians were also on the rampage; in vain Damasus urged the judge Bassus to intervene against them. The Novatians still existed, remnants of the Markionites, Montanists, Valentinian Gnostics. The pope took action against the Arians and Semiarians, against the "heretical" bishops Ursacius, Valens and Auxentius of Milan, all of whom he had condemned, against the emerging "false doctrine" of the patriarch Macedonius (Pneumatomachen), against those of the Apollinarists. The Donatists had also been represented in Rome for a short time, where at that time, after all, four different "churches" were fighting each other, all having their own chief shepherds, the Donatists since the beginning of the 4th century the sixth bishop in succession. The Luciferian presbyter Macarius was forbidden by Damasus to perform clerical duties and, when he held services at night in a private house, he had his clergymen, together with the state police (officiales), pick him up and drag him before a secular judge under maltreatment. Since Macarius did not go over to Damasus even by threats, he was sent to Ostia, where he succumbed to his injuries (cf. I 390). It should also be recalled that St. Damasus did not receive the hunted Spanish bishops Priscillian, Instansius, and Salvian in the winter of 381/82, despite their imploring pleas ("Give us ear ... give us, we beseech ..."), Priscillian and his richest followers, among them the widow Euchrotia, blessed with goods, were tortured and beheaded in Trier in 358, whereupon the Inquisition invaded Spain (I 435 ff). Assemblies and services of the Ursinians were also blown up in cemeteries by Damasian shock troops, Ursinus and comrades were banished by Emperor Valentinian I first to Gaul, then to Milan, without him ceasing to act from afar, not only against Damasus, but also against his successor. And when the emperor allowed him to return

in 367, there were new fights, after which he was expelled forever and interned in Cologne. But the quarrel continued as long as Damasus lived. And as late as 368, the majority of the Roman Synod refused to excommunicate antipope Ursinus, no matter how much Damasus pushed and made promises. "We did not come together to condemn anyone unheard." 37

The pope was suspect in too many ways; too much suspect. And more than suspect.

In 371 Damasus was accused of adultery.

Now the "tickler of the ladies' ears," whose father had himself been a priest (at San Lorenzo), was indeed in closest contact with rich women, but he was also the author of some (not preserved) tracts on virginity, was, according to Jerome, who was highly experienced in this very matter, himself a virgin teacher of a virgin church; a clergyman, too, who preached to clergy "to keep the bed chaste," "to beget children for God" (a somewhat ambiguous formulation, perhaps), who commanded perpetual abstinence, since "yet holy things are for holy ones," "carnal union means defilement" (cf. Leo I, p. 258), the priest who lived "unchastely" put himself "on a level with the animals" and did not deserve the name of priest. Could such a pope be an adulterer? A man "adorned with all kinds of virtues," who by his godly walk "set himself an eternal monument," as Bishop Theodoret praises? A man of whom Grone's last sentence of his Damasus chapter affirms: "Already his contemporaries venerated him as a saint and still today the Italian people invoke his intercession against fevers"? 38

Meanwhile, Damasus was accused not only of adultery but of a whole series of serious crimes by Isaac, a Jew who had converted but returned to the synagogue (and was allegedly not left alone until his death in 381). Yes, he was even accused of murder. "So far, finally, did the party of Ursinus stoop," one later lamented, "that, under pretext of the Jew Isaac ... the head of our holy brother Damasus was demanded." And since he was incriminated, although the emperor was behind him, terrible

n8 First Rivalries and Tumults

Charges were present. Valentinian I had investigations initiated by his special representative, the prefect Maximin (whom Ammian compares to a circus beast let loose - he was executed in 376), then in the trial, in which individual witnesses, invited clerics, were also tortured, tried before himself, but at last the proceedings were stopped. This, of course, was hardly due to the intervention of the Antiochian priest Eua-grios, a friend of the emperor's youth, but because the government had stood up for Damasus from the beginning and could not now bring him down by a criminal complaint of the opposing party. Thus Valentinian now praised Damasus as "virum mentis sanctissimae".

Nevertheless, his reputation was ruined to such an extent that seven years later, at a synod in Rome, which he himself presided over, he had himself rehabilitated and the charges against him branded as slanderous. This very synod, of course, sought to remove the Roman bishop from state jurisdiction altogether! And 'strove at the same time for the cooperation of the state in the execution of ecclesiastical judgments! It understood the "secular arm", which the Holy Father rejected far from itself, already as an executing organ of the Inquisition. Clerics from all over Italy who disobeyed the verdict of an ecclesiastical court were to be brought before the bishop of Rome in the second instance with the help of the authorities. For the rest of the clergy of the West, the metropolitans were to be the second instance, and for the trials of the metropolitans themselves, the Roman bishop or his delegated judge was to have jurisdiction. "Your pious Majesty," says the petition, which St. Ambrose had also strongly influenced, "wishes to order that anyone who has been condemned by the Roman bishop's sentence and unlawfully wishes to keep his church . . be summoned by the prefects of Italy or the imperial vicar of Rome, or else present himself to judges appointed by the Roman bishop.... But whoever is excluded in this way, if he does not shun God's judgment, should at least be made by state coercion not to increase his sins.... , "3' Murderer Pope Damasus fights Counter-Pope Ursinus 119

Damasus' presumptuous advance certainly had success. The still very young emperor (402. ff), who was strongly criticized by the clergy, especially by Ambrose, adopted the synod's proposal almost verbatim and gave it the force of law. Yes, Gratian was in one point more pontifical than the pope. He decreed the participation of imperial officials in the execution of episcopal judgments not only for Italy, but for the entire Western Roman Empire. Admittedly, all this was more on paper, the patriarch of Rome did not yet have the position in the Occident that the patriarchs of the East had within their patriarchate.⁴⁰ Even a Doctor of the Church, St. Basil the Bishop, "the Great," complained bitterly about this pope. He called him blind, arrogant, saw him arrogantly on a "lofty throne" and once regretted having asked him for something, because the arrogant one becomes "even more arrogant when one meets him politely". In the West, Basil writes, "they neither know the truth nor want to know it," indeed, he claims that they "quarreled with people who told them the truth, but themselves approved of heresy." On the other hand, St. Jerome (a great schemer, liar, forger of documents, and thus predestined to be the patron of Catholic theological faculties: 1169 ff), who always hung his cloak to the wind, courted this pope. Who connected with Peter's chair, Jerome wrote, was his man. "Following no guide but Christ, I join myself to communion with Thy Holiness, that is, with the Cathedra of Peter; upon this rock I know the Church to be built." ⁴¹

Jerome's sycophantic complacency found most courteous favor with the imperious hierarch in Rome, where the Doctor of the Church traveled in 382. He soon played a great role under Damasus, served him as secretary, secret scribe, wrote, so he says himself, "the notices on synodal consultations from East and West", apostrophized the pope as "light of the world and salt of the earth", flattered: "Now the sun of justice rises in the Occident". He also supported Damasus' fight against the Luciferians. And even though Jerome called St. Lucifer

iiio First Rivalries and Tumults

of Cagliari (I 389 ff) at first praised him as a stronghold of orthodoxy, he immediately opposed the Sardinian bishop's followers in Rome, where the priest Macarius was massacred at the time (p. 116), and hurled one of his infamous pamphlets against him, probably mainly to please the old pope, in whose place he himself hoped to come. (Instead of him, however, St. Siricius followed, whom Jerome therefore still belittles after years). Lucifer's partisans, however, complained of Damasus shortly after 380:

"Accepting the authority of a king (accepta auctoritate regali), he persecutes Catholic priests and laymen and sends them into exile." ⁴²

Growing claims to primacy under Damasus

Various initiatives of this man now opened a development that increased the importance and rank of his see and gradually made the Roman bishop the lord of all occidental prelates.

It is not by chance that a contemporary speaks of the "arrogantia Damasi (ut princeps episcopatus)".

And today the Catholic "Handbook of Church History" calls him a "purposeful advocate of a steadily growing Roman claim to primacy, which through him finds hitherto unknown formulations." In part, he strives for this primacy by appealing to Mt. 16,18 f, to the Petrine principle that gave Rome "singularity", but also creates new expressions for it.

His desire for leadership, however, was supported

by Emperor Gratian, a mostly docile youth (I 402. ff). Not only did he renounce the title of "pontifex maximus," hitherto due to the ruler, in favor of the Roman bishops, but in 378 he also increased their jurisdiction by imperial law for the West, within limits that could hardly be fixed in the end. Damasus, who issued the first decretal, i.e., made decrees in the imperial command tone, also asserted the church foundation of Rome by Peter

Growing claims to primacy under Damasus 121 and Paul, a double apostolate, he was the first "pope", as far as is known, to speak of the "apostolic see", to have it said of him that he "surpassed all those to

whom he was equal in office (munus) by the prerogatives of the apostolic see" (praerogativa apostolicae sedis), and to this day the Roman episcopate has ever since been called the "Sedes Apostolica". All this founded and promoted the Roman primacy airs. "Damasus allowed himself to be privileged by the state and acted like a king" (Haendler).⁴³

As an aside, he also acted as a poet. He wrote miserable but numerous inscriptions (tituli), of which more than half a hundred still exist in whole, in fragments, or in literary tradition. He satisfied his poetic needs with stereotyped phrases borrowed from Virgil and then had his epigrams transferred to marble by the hand of the calligrapher Furius Dionysius Philokalus – "never," sneered Louis Duchesne, "have worse verses been endowed with greater waste", Damasus' excretions, as artless as they were spiritless, were intended not least for his own posthumous fame, and were above all for the "many bodies of the saints, which he sought out, found" and, according to the Vita Damasi of the Liber Pontificalis, "glorified with verse. 44

For example, "Deep under the weight of the mountain lay hidden the tomb, Damasus brought it to light". Or: "Damasus did not suffer that those who were buried according to common law, after they had found rest, suffered sad penance again. So he attacked the great laborious work and had the immense masses of earth of the hilltop removed, diligently searched the earth's secret bowels, drained all the waterlogged terrain, and encountered the spring that now gives gifts of salvation." Or, to return to the subject at hand, a final papal poetry product: "Know that here, in ancient times, the saints had their dwelling place, whose names, if you ask, are Peter and Paul. The Orient sent these disciples – we readily admit – but for the sake of the merit of their blood – though following Christ above the stars they arrived in the bosom of heaven and the kingdom of the pious

izi First Rivalries and Tumults

are – Rome was allowed to claim them as her citizens. So may Damasus proclaim your praise, you new stars!"⁴⁵

It may be left undecided or written in the stars how many saints the one so eagerly searching for martyrs has swindled in this way. But this is how it looks when a murderer pope becomes "poet pope". (One compares still far more eloquent places of Pius* XII in the 20th century!)⁴⁶

Since Damasus there is also the theory of the three Petrine-seats Alexandria, Antioch and Rome to justify their patriarchal rights; whereby among the three great Thronoi, of course, "the first seat of the Apostle Peter belongs to the Roman Church". But even according to Pope Gregory I, "the Great" and Doctor of the Church, these three seats are "one seat and that of one (St. Peter), which by divine authority is now presided over by three bishops." According to which the Alexandrian and Antiochian patriarchs, as Peter's successors, by virtue of "divine" right, have the authority to govern a part of the Church. Apart from some historical dubiousness, a rather double-edged theory.

How did Rome come to this? Well, on the one hand, it could thus, when it was not yet as powerful as it wanted to be, put itself on a par with the influential Eastern Church leaders and yet, as the headquarters, so to speak, of the Prince of the Apostles, claim the greatest honor itself. And then, the real reason, it tried by means of this theory to fight its most feared rival, the Patriarch of Constantinople, since he, as representative of a non-Petrine see, had no right to a primacy. And it is in this context that the theory readily appears: in the time of Damasus precisely, in Leo I, Gregory I, Nicholas I, Leo IX – with the theoretical denial of Constantinople's claims to patriarchal dignity eventually followed, reluctantly enough, by practical recognition.⁴⁷

To be sure, the development of papal suzerainty was only beginning. Damasus' position was, after all, strongly contested even in Rome throughout his pontificate. In the West and beyond, it was not he who led the church, but clearly

Growing claims to primacy under Damasus 12.3

Ambrose (I ch. 9). The Milanese influenced, not to say dominated, the emperors with cunning "spiritual" strategy that still sets a precedent today, and his episcopal city was also the capital of the West. Even the sensational triumph over the Roman goddess of victory in the senate hall (I 421 ff) was not won by Damasus, but exclusively by Ambrose, the powerful resident prelate, as in all other cases. Nowhere can we speak of "papal politics". The bishop of Rome did not even command all of Italy in the 4th century. He apparently governed only the so-called suburbic churches, the southern and central part of the peninsula (delimited there by a line roughly from the Gulf of La Spezia to the mouth of the Po). "Beyond this, nothing is to be discovered of any kind of powers of the Bishop of Rome" (Haller). Certainly his see was the most prestigious in the West. But he himself was still under the jurisdiction of the vicarius urbis. And when one tried just at that time by a petition to withdraw the Roman bishop from the punitive power of the city prefect (almost always still a pagan) and to create for him a preferred place of jurisdiction before the sovereign, this refused even a Gratian, without going into it further. As an alternative to the imperial court, it was now also proposed to subject the Roman to the (spiritual) jurisdiction of a council. For the first time in church history, the claim – also reported by Ambrosius – that Emperor Valentinian I had decreed that clergymen could only be judged by clergymen, appeared at a papal synod. For even at that time nothing was known about the fact that "the first chair may not be judged by anyone," as was later taught.⁴⁸

i24 First Rivalries and Tumults

Innocent I, "the head of the episcopal office," OR LOUD LIES?

The popes who followed Damasus and Siricius (384–399), who was also still completely in the shadow of Ambrose, who was a personal friend of his, nowhere appearing to set the tone, to lead, nevertheless expanded the primacy of Rome, its monopoly position as "apostolica sedes," as "cathedra Petri," in short, the idea of the Roman Church as the head of the universal Church, more and more; In doing so, they used the Bible, that is, what suited them in it, as well as Roman law.

And not least the official jargon.

Especially Siricius, who also coined the term "heir" of Peter – a foundation of every future pope ideology – in order to suggest a quasi-uristic connection between his peers and the apostle, adapted his decrees to a large extent to the style and terminology of the imperial decrees. Of course, only the synods had used their model in the church so far. Siricius, however, now presented his new decretal legislation as "a well-known type of ecclesiastical law and at the same time placed it on the same level as the synodal canons" (Woj-towytsch). But as much as the "heir" of Peter liked to appear as suzerain, as much as he emphasized his leading role and legal supremacy within the universal Church – "We decide," he wrote in his very first decretal, immediately after his consecration, to the Spanish bishop Himerius of Tarroco, "what from now on all churches must follow and what they must refrain from doing ..." –, reality was still far from theory. The "heir" (haeres), the successorship of Peter, the investiture that just appoints the Pope as heir, was a pure construction that lacked and still lacks any provability and therefore legal validity.⁴⁹

Innocent I (402–417; cf. I 496 f), who was said to be able to bear the title of "first pope" with more right than any of his predecessors, developed the papal claims to primacy and the monopoly position of the Roman Church purposefully –

Innocent I, "the pinnacle of the episcopal office," 125 consciously furthered them and thus continued to have an impact into the 12th century. He set the tone for a millennium. He was helped in many ways: the powerful Ambrose, his rival in Milan, was dead, Milan itself was no longer the residence, but Ravenna, and the Western Roman Empire was quite close to collapse. The decisive factor, however, came from himself. He felt himself to be "the head and the highest summit of the episcopate". Yes, to the synods of Carthage and Mileve in 416 he represented the claim – which he admittedly did not

always dare to defend to all churches – that without knowledge of the "Apostolic See" even councils could not finally decide "matters even of the most distant regions". Cold as ice, he, the jurist, presents new law as old, new customs as traditional, holy ones, without the past offering any examples or basis for it. But all this was cleverly calculated, for: "Only by claiming to be long-standing what was in reality the boldest innovation could he hope to withstand the criticism of his contemporaries" (Haller). He appeared outrageously self-confident, however adapted to the local conditions, thus in Spain somewhat more briskly than in Gaul, where Rome had still recently had difficulties. He wanted a supreme supervision over the synods and proclaimed the "Apostolic See" as the highest instance of appeal, to which

all serious cases (*causae maio-res*) – he could of course interpret this as he wished – were to be submitted. ("The epitaphs praise in him especially the virtues of meekness and modesty": Gröne.)⁵⁰ Innocent I was the first pope to use "the juridical idea of the pope as the successor of Peter consistently and systematically" (Ullmann). Peter or his disciples were considered by him to be the founders of all the churches of the West, for which there is nowhere even the slightest evidence. "Is it not an obvious fact," he boldly states in a letter to Decentius of Gubbio, "that in all Italy, Gaul, Spain, Africa, Sicily, and the intervening islands, no one has erected churches but those whom the venerable Apostle Peter or his successors have made bishops. Just read if

iz6 First rivalries and tumults

any other of the apostles is found in those countries, who, according to tradition, is said to have taught there. But if it is not to be read, because it is nowhere handed down, all must follow what is preserved by the Roman Church, from which without all doubt they took their origin." Because nothing else is written anywhere, Pope Innocent breathtakingly concludes, everything was proselytized by Peter or his disciples and thus subject to the Roman bishop. One understands Haller's sneer, with greater audacity the *argumentum e silentio*, the proof from the silence of the sources, "has probably never been used for a historical assertion which in truth floats completely in the air." And Erich Caspar emphasizes that the Doctor of the Church Augustine, next to whom "the figure of Innocent I seems almost to disappear", had represented "the exact opposite of the innocent thesis". Even the Catholic pope historians Seppelt/Schwaiger write that what the pope says there – a tremendously serious, far-reaching assertion, more correctly: untruth – is "by no means in harmony with the historical facts"; "but it reflects the thoughts that have gained more and more influence in Rome" and to which, we may add, the papacy is owed – nothing but lies! Innocent, however, deduces special rights, that is, of course, privileges, the observance of the "*referre ad sedem apostolicam*", the respect of the *consuetudo Romana* as the only valid norm. Only the decision of the Roman bishop makes final any decision on any matter of importance, on the *causae maiores*. The alleged seat of Peter becomes "föns" and "caput" – "all waters flow from the apostolic see, as it were the fountainhead, and pour in purest form over all the regions of the earth" (*totius mundi regiones*). And lied icily, the *referre ad sedem apostolicam* corresponds to old tradition!⁵¹

Perhaps lies and deception were already in Pope Innocent's blood. He is most likely the son of his predecessor Anastasius I, who in turn came from a priestly marriage.

Innocent I, "the pinnacle of the episcopal office" 127

There were in Rome, parenthetically noted, after all through the whole first millennium priest scions who became popes; among others: Boniface I, Felix III (said to be the great-grandfather of Pope Gregory L, the "Great"), Agapet I, bishop's son Theodore I, bishop's son Hadrian II (whose former wife Stefania and whose daughter was murdered by a son of Bishop Arsenius, a multiple father). Martin II was also a priest's son, likewise Boniface VI (who led such a scandalous life as a presbyter that Pope John VIII had to suspend him; he reigned a mere two weeks and was possibly poisoned). St. Pope Silverius

(exiled by his successor Vigilius to the island of Ponza, where he died) is even the son of Pope Hormisdas. St. John XI (who had his mother, together with his papal half-brother, thrown into prison and murdered there, but, according to the chronicler Flodoard of Rheims, was "without violence..., occupied only with divine things"; "vigor and energy cannot be denied to his pontificate": the Catholics Seppelt/Schwaiger), Pope John XI was the son of Pope Sergius III (the murderer of his two predecessors. But he also rebuilt, not to completely conceal "the good" [?], the Lateran Basilica destroyed by an earthquake). And did not Damasus require the clergy to "beget children for God" (p. 117)?⁵²

Or should I have shared the liturgical decrees of Pope-spring Innocent? To give the kiss of peace at Mass only after the consecration? To read the names of the sacrificing faithful only after the appropriate prayers of the priest over the gifts? To fast on Saturday out of mourning for the Savior resting in the tomb? (Cf. 112 f.) Pope historian Gröne fills exactly half of his Innocent chapter with such nonsense, to the greatest benefit of the reader, of course, who thus "gets to know in Saint Innocent a pope experienced in ecclesiastical customs and laws and imbued with an apostolic spirit".⁵³

In any case, he knew his business. Did he know how to single out the Roman superiority, the superior, monocrat

12.8 First Rivalries and Tumults

He was an unapproachable, but decisive gentleman, who never lost sight of the brothers for a moment, but who also hardly ever forgot diplomatic cleverness, as his successors often did. The tone of his letters, richly interwoven with biblical quotations, less threatening than cuttingly polite, not infrequently subtly ironic, discreetly humiliating, had a style-defining effect in spiritual epistolography. "We believe that you know this anyway," he writes. Or, "Who should not know?" "Who should not yet have known?" Miramur was his favorite word, his almost stereotypical rebuke. "We marvel that a wise man should call for our advice about these things which are perfectly certain and universally known". "We have long wondered while reading your letter"; "we wonder that the bishops overlook such things, so that one might judge that they abetted or did not know of the unlawfulness." Caspar comments well: "The true virtuosos of ruling prefer to work with such soft, sharp tones than with the thunderbolts of violent threatening speech; in this way they know how to achieve that the affected person recoils in fright, while coarse means harden him or provoke him to resistance. One can imagine that the suburbicarian episcopate may have trembled before this spiritual overlord." ⁵⁴

Yet Innocent I was quite flexible.

Toward the more distant Gallic bishops, he was already behaving more moderately. And in the East, even this wily priest had little to say. It is true that he wanted to control the church of Constantinople. He was probably the first pope who kept a chargé d'affaires at the residence there, an "apocrisiar", as the permanent papal representative at the imperial court of Constantinople was called, the most important diplomat of Rome - under Innocent apparently the priest Boniface, the later pope (p. 130 ff). It is true that Innocent - after Damasus, assuming the authenticity of his letters, had already spun his threads there - became, as it were, the founder of the papal vicariate of Thessalonike (Salonika), in that he, in the struggle against Constantinople and on the

Eulalius against Boniface 129

side of his own state government, claimed jurisdiction over eastern Illyria (Illyricum orientale), in 412 entrusted to Bishop Rufus "in our stead" (nostra vice) all the prefectures of the Illyrian prefecture, the churches in Achaia, Thessa-lia, Epirus vetus and nova, Crete, Dacia mediterranea and ripen-sis, Moesia, Dardania, and Praevalitana, also generously extended the metropolitan's privileges, namely "to judge everything that is negotiated in those regions." But when he and Honorius sent a delegation to Constantinople in the dispute over John Chrysostom, it was treated violently, not received by the

emperor, and sent home ignominiously (p. 154). The patriarchs of the East did not think of submitting to the "archbishop" of Rome, as even one Leo I was called at the Council of Chalcedon. And a fortiori, the emperor did not let a Roman bishop take the decision out of his hands. According to imperial law, Illyria was subject to Constantinople both ecclesiastically and politically, and for a long time Christian emperors and bishops continued to argue about it, it remained a special bone of contention between Rome and Byzantium, the occasion for ever renewed conflicts over jurisdiction and power struggles.³⁵ Eulalius v. Boniface,

"THE APOSTOLIC Globe."

There was a months-long struggle for the Roman see after the death of Pope Zosimus (417–418; cf. 1497 ff), who was the first to relate Jesus' alleged word of binding and loosing to the bishops of Rome, claiming for them, in startling inference, the same authority and veneration as Peter. Yes, Zosimus claimed that he had such great authority that no one was allowed to shake his *sententia* – "ut nullus de nostra possit retractare sententia". And he crowned this impertinence with the greater one that the "fathers" had considered this authority to be

130 First rivalries and tumults

apostolic! Despite his only brief pontificate, Zosimus further consolidated the *auctoritas sedis apostolicae* he so brusquely coveted, admittedly also provoking no less strident opposition, especially from the African Church.⁵⁶

On the very day of Zosimus' burial, December 27, Archdeacon Eulalius (418–419), the eldest of the diaconate, was made spiritual head of Rome in the Lateran Basilica. According to the opposing party, he had occupied the church even during the funeral ceremonies, barricaded the entrances and forced the will-less, because half-dead, "dying bishop of Ostia" (Wetzer/Welte), to his consecration. The next day the majority of the presbyters, who stood against the College of Deacons, and the majority of the people – but the reports, especially about the numerical proportions, contradict each other, as so often – in the Theodora Church elected the already aged presbyter Boniface I (418–422) as Roman chief shepherd. He was the son of the priest Secundius

and Innocent I's representative at the court in Constantinople. (The apocrisiar at the imperial residence has since been considered a particularly promising candidate for pope).

The indecisive Honorius was in trouble. A first imperial rescript of January 3, 419, recognized the election of Eulalius and expelled Boniface. A second imperial rescript of January 18 ordered both bishop candidates to Ravenna for negotiation. But when the situation came to a head and a synodal decision desired by Honorius failed due to the disagreement even of the neutral prelates, a third imperial decree on January 25 expelled the two high priestly candidates. A foreign bishop, Achilleus of Spoleto, was entrusted with the celebration of Easter on March 30; such a humiliation that a series of further imperial decrees became necessary: to the pagan city prefect Aurelius Anicius Symmachus (a nephew of the famous prefect of Rome with the same name, who once fought so vainly for the statue of Victoria, the goddess of victory: I 421 ff), to Bishop Achilleus, to the Senate, the people of the city. But the deacons' party wanted the disgrace to be brought by the emperor's commissioned

Eulalius against Boniface 131

Spoleto and would not allow Easter to be celebrated by a bishop from another place in Rome – although, as St. Irenaeus testifies, it was once not celebrated annually here (p. 91)! Perhaps, however, the deacons, who at that time already strongly rivaled the presbyters, saw only a favorable opportunity to intervene. In any case, Eulalius returned to Rome on March 18 to celebrate Easter himself in the Lateran. Shortly thereafter, Bishop Achilleus of Spoleto also appeared in the city, and there were arrests, interrogations, popular uprisings, and renewed bloody fighting over the churches.

Emperor Honorius, however, now went over to Boniface, who was supported by strong forces at court.

Princess Galla Placidia wrote several letters to prominent Catholics, to Augustine, Aurelius of Carthage, Paulin of Nola, promoting her protégé. Above all, however, it was the later emperor Flavius Constantius (p. 45), who liked to settle internal church conflicts, who decided the battle for the chair of Peter for Boniface. Honorius, however, who first stood by Eulalius, now had him chased away and, in view of the "ambitiones" of the Roman priests, decreed the first, admittedly practically meaningless, state pope election order: in a double election in Rome, in the future none of the elected should have a chance, but the entire congregation should determine the bishop in a new election/7.

In fact, disputes and divisions in Roman episcopal elections were by now so common that Augustine begins a letter to Boniface's successor Coelestine I (422–433) with the congratulatory remark: "As we hear, God has raised you, without any division of the congregation, to the chair of Peter" S8

Counter-pope Eulalius later became bishop of Nepe. Boniface I, however, like Innocent I a jurist, continued the papal ambitions of his predecessors vigorously and, always and unwaveringly looking to the universal episcopate of the Roman Church, continued them as usual with biblical and historical digressions, with "historical" examples, "documenta". Not the acti

iji First Rivalries and Tumults

The decisive factor, however, was not the reality, but, on the contrary, the ever more highly played Petrine idea, in short, the past was viewed with papal eyes and interpreted accordingly.^{5'}

At the same time, for Boniface, long an eastern expert on Rome before his election, Illyria admittedly possessed special significance. Of nine of his extant letters, three revolve around jurisdiction over the so-called papal vicariate of Thessalonica. At the instigation of bishops there dissatisfied with Rome and Patriarch Atticus, an edict of Emperor Theodosius II on July 14, 421 had placed it under the jurisdiction of the Church of Constantinople, "enjoying the prerogative of ancient Rome." Immediately Boniface, supported by the Emperor of the West, Honorius, to whom he complained of "the deceitfulness of some Illyrian bishops," protested and even succeeded. With appropriate biblical sayings and "historical" examples, he insisted, like his predecessors, on Rome's primacy, the monopolization of the Petrine office, the Petrine doctrine, whose rapid flight of fancy actually begins with him, and put the monocratic idea of rule, the "favor apostolicus", in the most beautiful light. The origin and governmental power of the Roman Church go back to the blessed Peter, and Rome is the head of all the churches of the world.... Whoever stands up against it is excluded from the kingdom of heaven, because only "the favor of the doorkeeper" Peter (*gratia ianitoris*) can open it. The doctrine of the indisputability of Petrine arbitrations and statutes, already advocated by Zosimus, was now rather aggravated by the presumptuous declaration: "No one may dare to raise his hand against the apostolic summit (*apostolico culmini*), whose judgment no one is permitted to attack". In short, the Church rests on Peter and his successor, on him depends "the totality of things," only those who obey him come to God.⁶⁰

To be sure, this did not eliminate the difficulties in Illyria. The opposition in the episcopate there did not fall silent, but Boniface took action. He called on his vicar to resist manfully, giving him the (indeed, not always so

Eulalius against Boniface 133

his seat a right be lost.... He will succor (you) and suppress the transgressors of the canons and the enemies of ecclesiastical law.... suppress." "What do you want," he wrote another time harshly, echoing Paul, "should I come to you with a rod or with love and a gentle spirit? For both, as you know, are possible for the blessed Peter, to meet the meek with gentleness and to chastise the haughty with the rod. Therefore, maintain the reverence due to the head." Some cases, in any case, Boniface wanted to see "eradicated" (*ressecari*). In this way, the Roman asserted himself in Illyricum, secured for the time being its belonging to his sphere of influence, yes, he led, and precisely in the attacks against the Illyrian opposition, Rome's claim to dominate the whole Church "to a hitherto unattained height"

(Wojtowysch).⁶¹

Thus, out of the ever-increasing domestic fragmentation and misery of the West, the papacy – fighting with or against the state as needed – morphed into a highly political potency, one of the most powerful and long-lived parasites in history. "The Holy See," it says with a meaningful misprint in the "Archivum Historiae Pontificiale" of the Pontifical University, 1978, "was more or less openly recognized as a qualified guardian of the faith of the law."⁶²

Even more rabidly than in Rome, however, was the dispute over the "Holy See" for the great episcopal sees of the East.

4- CHAPTER

THE STRUGGLE FOR THE EPISCOPAL SEES OF THE EAST IN THE

5TH CENTURY UNTIL THE COUNCIL OF CHALKEDON

"Struggles and discord have not been spared even to the Roman Church – But they never reached the degree of passion and bloody savagery that was the order of the day in the East." John Haller*

"The dispute over Origen developed into a formal war between the two capitals of the East and their powerful bishops: Theophilus of Alexandria and John of Constantinople." Jean Steinmann²

"In league with the Copts, and as far as possible with Rome, Theophilus, Cyril, and Dioscorus betrayed Greekness in Christianity in order to secure and increase the power of the Patriarch of Alexandria. But there were Pyrrhic victories ... The downfall of Greek Christianity in Egypt was already there at the moment when Theophilus, under the coercion of the Copts, had the Origenist Ammonios maltreated with the words, <"Heretic, curse Origen". This was at the same time the death sentence on the Greeks in Egypt in general."

Theologian Carl Schneider³

Just as among the cities of the Eastern Empire Alexandria initially held the first rank, so too the Alexandrian metropolitan long played the leading role in the Eastern Church. His patriarchate was from the beginning the most closed in the Orient, had an immense property and there until the Council of Constantinople (381) undisputed primacy. At least de facto it retained it, occasionally supported by Rome, until the "Robber Synod" of Ephesus in 449. Gradually, however, it was displaced in the hierarchy of the Oriental patriarchates by Constantinople, which had long been on the rise. The patriarchs of Alexandria wanted weak and incompetent colleagues in the capital, precisely because they themselves aspired to an Oriental papacy. Perhaps as the first chief bishops they used the title "archbishop" (archiepiskopos), at least since the 3rd century preferably also the designation "pope" (papas), which they kept permanently. (The designation patriarch came into use only very slowly in the 4th century). Even on the Catholic side one concedes since the foundation of Constantinople "an almost continuous jealousy to Alexandria against the seat to Constantinople" (Wetzer/Welte). But in order to bring down their rivals in the capital, the Alexandrians used the theological disputes in this epoch of "murderous fights about the origin of dogmas" (Katholik Heer).*

This is already shown with all vehemence by the power struggle between the Patriarchs Theophilus of Alexandria and John Chrysostom of Constantinople.

For a century, the Alexandrian bi-

The Struggle for the Episcopal Chairs of the East 137 bishop's chair people in the best tradition of St. Athanasius, the Doctor of the Church. That is, that they used against the state "with brilliance the proven techniques: Bribery, public opinion-making, use of their own bodyguards or gangs of armed sailors and monks" (F. G. Maier). The bishops of Alexandria kept hundreds of so called sick-bearers as a soldierly shock troop, with which they stormed temples, synagogues, plundered the Jews, chased them away, and generally terrorized everything that did not suit them, including the imperial

authorities. Gradually, however, the Patriarch of Constantinople, the new capital, the "Second Rome", gained more and more prestige and influence. Finally, the 2nd Ecumenical Council in Constantinople in 381 granted him honorary primacy over all Oriental bishops (can. 3). Yes, the 4th Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon in 451, against the sharp protest of the Pope, placed him on an equal footing with him (can. 28). Accordingly, the property and income of the patriarchate, whose properties and enterprises (domains, vineyards, mills) were scattered all over its territory and constantly increased by donations and legacies, naturally increased.

The Alexandrian hierarchs, however, did not voluntarily back down, but took up the fight with all means. Their attempt to enthrone an Alexandrian in Constantinople already during the Council of 381 failed. After the death of Bishop Nectarius (397) – whom Emperor Theodosius I had promoted, but Pope Damasus had opposed – the Alexandrian Theophilus' intention to bring his candidate to the capital, the Alexandrian presbyter Isidore (whom we have already met in a fatal political mission: I 444), also failed. He was probably only supposed to be a placeholder for the patriarch's nephew Kyril-los, who was still too young. But twenty years later Theophilus (385–412) was successful. For now the priest, as educated as he was unscrupulous, a pharaoh of the lands around the Nile, who hoped to become a kind of primate of the entire Orient, succeeded in overthrowing John Chrysostom, the head of the church of Constantinople, with the help of the court, sending him into the desert and to his death.⁶

ij8 The Struggle for the Episcopal Chairs of the East.

Barely two decades before John's entry into Constantinople (398–404), wild feuds with the Arians had still raged there (I 420). Now he found only a secondary bishop, Sisinnius, chief shepherd of the Novatians, whom Theodosius tolerated as the only ones besides the Catholics. Sisinnius hardly caused the patriarch any grief, was also appreciated by "orthodox", especially at court, was eloquent, witty. The only noticeable thing, especially with the strict asceticism of the Novatians, was his twice-daily visit to the thermal baths. But when asked why he bathed twice a day in a warm bath, Sisinnius answered deliciously: "Because three times is not good for me!"⁷

According to the *Menaion*, the liturgical book of the Byzantine Church, John Chrysostom (I 133 ff), born in Antioch as the son of a high army officer who died at an early age, was strikingly small, extremely gaunt, had a large head, large ears, a big nose and a sparse beard. After having been a monk in the desert for some years, he became a presbyter in Antioch in 386 because of a stomach ailment (by asceticism), where probably Bishop Meletios called him (I 379 ff). Then he owed the fateful change to the patriarchal chair to the old Eutrop (p. 15 f). For when emperor Arcadius was undecided about his successor after the death of Nectarius (397), the supreme court eunuch and all-powerful minister fetched the already famous (anti-Jewish) preacher John by extra mail to the capital. Theophilus wanted to prevent this. But a reference to the material available against him and sufficient for criminal proceedings silenced him. Yes, none other than the protesting Alexandrian had to consecrate John as bishop in February 398!⁸

Theophilus, of course, did not give up his plans, but used the almost world-wide kettling against Origenism, the war between "Origenists" and "Anthropomorphites" that was tearing apart especially the Oriental monks, to promote his ecclesiastical policy, that is, to fight against the Patriarchate of Constantinople.

Rioting monks and Theophil's change of front 139

Rioting monks and Theophil's change of front

In the later 4th century, tens of thousands of monks already lived in the East, especially in Egypt, the classical land of ascetics. From countless monasteries and hermitages, they began their triumphal march through Sinai, Palestine, Syria, Asia Minor and the western provinces of the empire. In the Orient, however, they already had a considerable influence on society, the people and the leading classes. In

some hermit colonies people traveled from far away to "edify" themselves. People admired the eccentricity, the mortifications, the night vigils of the "wrestlers of Christ"; they were venerated almost superstitiously, almost as supernatural beings'.

On the one hand, these people had charitable merits: by granting hospitality, regular hostels for strangers, refuges, by caring for the poor, the sick, prisoners, slaves; here and there also by a certain "cultural" activity: creation of books, for example, libraries, without, of course, as already shown by Harnack, being particularly well versed in theology. On the other hand, already in 370 Emperor Valens had to intervene by law against the "lovers of laziness" in the "communities of monks" (monazontes) and ordered that they should be "brought out of their hiding place with an official order and ordered back to their tasks in the home town". After all, the monks, these "perfect Christians", had a profession "whose practice, like that of no other, was compatible with every degree of stupidity, laziness and ignorance" (E. Stein). And despite the prohibition of Emperor Theodosius I, they soon vagabonded everywhere, pushing especially into the cities, where eventually there were close to 600 monasteries of monks and nuns in the Ennaton district of Alexandria - "populated like hives of bees" (Severos of Ashmunein). The orthodox Chrysostom criticized their tramping through the cities, as did the "heretical" Nestorios, who even excommunicated them for it. But could

140 The Struggle for the Episcopal Chairs of the East

a bishop could be sure of their support, his power was hardly limited. Throughout the ages, right up to the 20th century - most blatantly in the Croatian Ustasha state, where they function as leaders of regular murder gangs, as concentration camp commanders - the monks have been politically abused by powerful people, by the clergy, by the state, and have apparently also been happy to allow themselves to be abused. They play a prominent role in the destruction of paganism, in the robbing and grinding of temples, but not infrequently also in the inner-church struggle. Their "spiritual" existence turns "into a life of lawlessness" (Dominican Camelot). They go to the cities, they cause riots, they get involved in dogmatic disputes, in ecclesiastical affairs, they stand up against their abbots, in the Great Laura against Sabas or against Geor-gios. More often they attack bishops; in Constantinople the Catholic church leaders Paulos, Gregory of Nazianzus, John Chrysostom, who "often" wished "that there were no need for monasteries and that such peace of law (eunomia) prevailed in the cities that no one would ever have to flee into the desert". Monk clusters fight, however, also under the notorious abbot Schenute, saint of the Coptic church (p. 203 ff), under the holy church teacher Cyril or his uncle Theopilus. "Not for nothing [!] did the popes and patriarchs turn again and again to the monastic circles. After all, they knew that it was easy for them to exert an effective pressure on the decisions of the government by means of the popular crowd." Their bulk is of an "astonishing primitiveness" which is merely "balanced" by the arguments of "physical force"; indeed, they fight "all the more ruthlessly because they believed themselves to be pneumatics under the special guidance of the Holy Spirit" (Bacht SJ).¹⁰

In the East, it comes - as significant as fatal - to a change of front of the Alexandrian bishop. He needed the religious bullies to pursue his goals. Those of the Nitrian Desert, a depression of the Libyan, where, according to Palladios, about 5000 of them are said to have dwelt, were frequently Rioting monks and Theophil's change of front 141 fig followers of Origen (I 171 f), those of the Sketian Desert probably predominantly anthropomorphists; they liked to understand the biblical anthropomorphism literally. Theophil, already attached to this faction through his confidant, the presbyter Isidore, an ardent Origenist, first associated himself with the monks of the Nitrian Desert. He promoted their leaders, the four "long brothers," except for their eldest, Ammon, a fanatical ascetic who allegedly burned soon this, soon that limb with a red-hot iron and resolutely defied the patriarch. Dioskor, however, who was also opposed to him, he made bishop of Little Her-mopolis, Euthymius and Eusebius priests and administrators of the church property in Alexandria, until the patriarch's blatant

greed for money drove them back into the desert.

Even as late as his Easter encyclical in 399, Theophilus fiercely attacked the "anthropomorphites," who thought of God in physical form like a human being. Thereupon these from the Sketian Desert, from Pachomios monasteries of Upper Egypt, poured in large heaps to Alexandria, plunged everything into panic and threatened to kill the patriarch if he did not recant. Theophil, on the one hand an avid reader of Origen, on the other hand compared to Pharaoh because of his lust for power and ostentation, reviled as a "gold-worshipper", "dictator of Egypt", now changed camps, since the general mood also turned more and more against Origen. He declared that he hated Origen as well and had long since decided on his damnatio. He became a flaming defender of the Anthropomorphites, flattered the angry monk-demonstrators: "You seem to me as if I see God's face", started a "cleansing" of Egypt from Origenism, yes, furthermore opened an anti-Origenist propaganda on a grand scale, a "formal crusade" (Grützmacher). Still a supporter of Origen in 399, only a year later at a synod in Alexandria he banned his controversial teachings together with his followers, especially the "long brothers", except Dioskor. However, he also used a series of Easter letters of the following years for a wild pole

The struggle for the bishop's chairs of the East

mics, now warning against the "blasphemies," the "madness," the "criminal error of Origen, that hydra of all heresies," who equated Satan with the Son of God. Origen, Theophil claimed, was an idolater, he had "mocked Christ and brought the devil to high honors", had written "countless garrulous books, full of void words and unrhymed stuff" and had "mixed his own stench with the fragrance of heavenly teachings". Whereby he served with full intention such an atrocious ragout of this theologian that it had to make all "orthodox believers" sick.

In a circular letter to the bishops he claimed that the "pseudo-monks", in their madness "capable of any crime", sought his life. They "bribed common rabble with money in order to provoke a bloodbath. Only by the grace of God was a greater disaster prevented. We endured everything in humble patience ..." In reality, he himself, accompanied by soldiers, hastened to the Nitric Desert for the persecution of the Origenists, including the four "long brothers." One of their spokesmen, the aged Ammon, he threatened to strangle with his cloak and beat him so that the blood shot out of his nose. He also proceeded with expulsion from the church against the presbyter Isidore, the nearly eighty-year-old Origen devotee, whom he had wanted to elevate to patriarch of the capital just a few years ago, after attempted bribery, coercion to give false testimony (he was supposed to testify untruthfully that a deceased woman had bequeathed her property to the patriarch's sister. Furthermore, he slandered him severely and accused him - eighteen years earlier! - "sodomitic" fornication with a ship's boy). Finally, in the middle of the night, at the head of a half-drunk raiding party, including his black Ethiopian slaves, he himself attacked a monastery, plundered and burned it along with its library, killing a boy in the fire - "and even the most sacred mysteries" (Benedictine Baur). The indictment of the abused monks included seventy points. But Pope Anastasius I (399-401) called Theophil a "holy and honorable man" (vir sanctus et honorabilis) and

Church Teachers Jerome and Cons. 143 confessed, in a letter to Patriarch John of Jerusalem, his theological cluelessness by confessing that until recently he had known neither who Origen was nor what he wrote!¹¹

Doctors of the Church Jerome and consorts render "shear services" to Theophil against Doctrine of the Church John

Some hundred monks fled from Egypt in 401; some to Constantinople, most of them to Palestine, where, of course, the church teacher Jerome was now also fighting the Origenists. The great saint and patron saint of scholars, immortalized by Altdorfer, Dürer, Leonardo da Vinci, had so far done much for the dissemination of Origen in the Latin West, had enthusiastically translated several of his works, had

also shamelessly written him out, like so many, indeed, celebrated him as "the greatest teacher of the Church since the Apostles" (1172), as an "immortal genius," indignant that he was once attacked in Rome "not because of the novelty of his theses, not because of heresy, as angry dogs now pretend against him, but because one could not bear the fame of his eloquence and knowledge." After all, the church teachers Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, Athanasius and Ambrose had once also supported Origen. But now, as his opponents gained momentum, Pope Anastasius opposed him, the bishops Simplicianus of Milan, Chromatius of Aquileia, synods in Jerusalem, Alexandria, on Cyprus, Jerome, like other prominent church leaders, abruptly changed sides. He shamelessly disavowed his old master and, like Theophil, became a rabid anti-Origenist overnight.

In one of his own writings, he attacks Bishop John of Jerusalem, who does not want to abandon Origen, but is in any case against Jerome in the "War of the Monks". "You," apostrophizes

i44 The struggle for the episcopal chairs of the East.

Jerome to him, "the holy father, the exalted bishop, the celebrated orator, you scarcely dignify your fellow servants with a glance, who like you are bought by the blood of your Lord.... You despise the laity, the deacons and the priests, you boast that you could make a thousand clerics in an hour ... Your lickspittles claim that you are more eloquent than Demosthenes, more astute than Chrysippus, wiser than Plato, and you apparently believe it yourself." Thus scolding, sneering, insulting, the holy Doctor of the Church fights against the bishop of Jerusalem, whom he accuses of having offered up the state against him. "A monk, ah, a monk threatens other monks with exile and obtains a decree of banishment: a monk who boasts of sitting on the chair of an apostle." 12

One can see how here, as usually, politics, church politics and theology are inextricably intertwined. But if at that time Patriarch Theophil still sought to mediate between the contending parties, he now quickly changed fronts. Still at the end of the year 396 he had wanted to pacify the opponents, but Jerome gave him an answer that will be repeated in the whole history of the church: "We too desire peace, and we not only desire it, we demand it, but the peace of Christ, the true peace".

This peace, the peace of "Christ", the "true", the "genuine peace", is what the disciples of the Lord seek throughout the centuries: against schismatics, "heretics", unbelievers, against external enemies, internal ones, against anyone who does not think like them. Always and everywhere, even in the 20th century, one hears this phrase of the "true", of the "real" peace - and it is too frequent, typical, too verdoofing the masses, the generations, is far too hypocritically high-minded also not to insist on it casually here. It was rampant in the First World War, in the Second, in the Cold War afterwards, in the church's pushing of the rearmament of West Germany, when, for example, Cardinal Frings, a member of the CDU, at the German Catholics' Day in Bochum, scolded conscientious objection "a reprehensible sentimentality," "humanitarianism," and said: "After the Ge

Doctors of the Church Jerome and Consorts 145

thanks of the Pope, therefore, warfare directed against injustice is not only a right but even the duty [!] of all states.... True peace [!] can only [!] be based on the divine order. Wherever this is attacked, the peoples must also restore the destroyed order by force of arms." 13

Ergo: real peace is only where their interests, where all the interests of the papacy - and where there would have been none! - are safeguarded. If not, then war one way or the other, but not least "by force of arms"! This and only this this Gelichter of Hieronymus, Augustinus e quanti viri understands until today under the "peace of Christ", the "true peace", the "divine order" - their advantage, their power, their glory: nothing else*.

In the meantime, then, Theophil had also changed sides, and Jerome, always spraying all his venom against "heretics," still in his turn drove the patriarch to cut out "the bad germs with a sharp sickle."

Triumphantly gloating, the saint observed and reported the hunt and the successes of the Alexandrian.

He congratulated him on his attacks on the "heretics," "the scattered vipers," to the most secret hiding places of Palestine. Egypt, Syria, and almost all of Italy were thus freed from the danger of this error, and the whole world rejoiced at his victories.¹⁴

Since Theophil was everywhere zealous against the fugitives, writing letters to the chief shepherds of Palestine and Cyprus, to individual bishops, to Anastasius of Rome, since he sent emissaries against the fugitives, so that even John of Jerusalem did not protect them, they continued to flee to Constantinople. And John Chrysostom took them in, interceded for them, indeed, the government summoned Theophil to a council in the capital where John was to pass judgment.

But Theophil knew how to turn the tables.

However much John ruled the masses, he was quite unsuitable as a court bishop. He had not only his Alexandrian rival against him, but also many other Catholic prelates. Most notably, Severian of Gabala in Syria, a bishop elected in Constan

146 The Struggle for the Bishop's Chairs of the East

tinople court circles, with an unusually good knowledge of the Bible, who fought for the Nicene faith as well as against "heretics" and Jews. Another was Bishop Acacius of Berea (Aleppo), whom the Syrian poet Baleus sang the praises of in five hymns. Further, Bishop Antiochus of Ptolemais (Acre in Phoenicia), as well as Macarius Magnes, probably identical with the bishop of Magnesia (in Caria or Lydia).¹⁵

Notably, however, John himself became persona non grata in the wealthy, highly civilized capital. He was fatal to the millionaires through "communist" sermons in which he thundered that their toilets of gold were more dear to them than the beggars in front of their villas. He also refused the invitations of the nobles (äristoi). His intransigent asceticism, the cause of constant stomach ailments, displeased the vivacious ladies of the court and others, whom he reproached privately or publicly for their attempts at rejuvenation. "Why do you wear powder and makeup on your faces like whores ...?" Especially as Empress Eudoxia, patron of clergy and church, at first also of Chrysostom, hated him at last. He had reviled her after seizing a plot of land "Jezabel". Reason enough for Theophil to pin a criminal charge on the opponent:

laesa maiestas. John simply excluded many clergymen; one deacon for adultery, one for murder. He even rigorously deposed bishops who had bought their consecration from the metropolitan of Ephesus, Antonin – he evaded by death – in exchange for fees, graduated according to annual income; for simony and greed were already flourishing in the clergy.

John was often unpopular also with his own priests, who indulged in a good life; above all, he was repugnant to the cultivators of syneisaktentum, the liaison with a consecrated woman, a "gynä syneisaktos", a "spiritual wife". The communion, which included even the – quite chaste – being together in bed, could be proved by its practitioners, like almost everything, also biblically, was tested a thousand times and lasted several centuries in East and West. Chrysostom, however, misunderstood this stubborn mortification, directed a harness

Of the Humility of a Prince of the Church 147

double treatise against them, claiming "that it would soon be better if there were no more (consecrated) virgins." ¹⁶

Finally, certain groups of monks strongly resisted the patriarch. Under Abbot Isaac, a Syrian who founded a monastery in Constantinople, a party of monks formed as early as the Antiochian's accession to the throne and bitterly opposed, slandered him for years. Abbot Isaac himself became an ardent partisan of Theophilus and a successful prosecutor in the trial of John.¹⁷

Of the humility of a prince of the church

Isaac and his followers had also haughtily berated the patriarch, proudly, admittedly hardly doing him

an injustice. The saint, a priest of the Most High, was, like so many of his ilk, anything but humble. He not only preached: "that is why he (God) placed us in the world, that we might be the stars ... that we might walk like angels among men ..."; he not only taught: "Nothing is more powerful than the Church, man ... The Church is stronger than the heavens.... for the sake of the church is heaven, not because of heaven the church is there"! But he himself called the emperor "fellow servant" before God, boasted that the bishop was also prince, and indeed "even more venerable than that (the emperor). For even the person of the emperor the sacred laws have subordinated to the (spiritual) authority of the bishop." He boasted "that the priest is much higher than a king", that "even the person of the king himself is subject to the power of the priest ... that the latter is a greater ruler than the latter". He could also exclaim: "The heads of the government do not enjoy such honor as the head of the churches. Who is the first at court, who when he comes into the company of women, who when he comes into the houses of the great? None has the rank before him. "18

And, of course, the patriarch wants spiritual dignity in every

148 The struggle for the episcopal chairs of the East.

case, he always wants to see it honored, "may its bearer be of whatever nature" – a demand, doctrine, that no "secular" tyrant could afford without going down in hurricanes of laughter; a peasantry of the simplest kind, which here, however, covers every amorality, every drudgery, which satisfies all the flock, the most stupid ones at that, the most. Can this church still "lead" so many, so great scoundrels, still make so colossal exploitations rich, so monstrous racketeering powerful – it itself is always immaculate, is holy – simply fabulous! (Cf. I 275.) And not at all for its sake does a prince of the church want to be idolized, courted, oh, who thinks so petty selfishly: "we want to be honored, but not for our sake – God forbid!" No, consider, cries "Goldmund," the patron saint of preachers – who, one must always remember, also permits lying for the purpose of salvation, proven by examples even of the Old as well as the New Testament –, "consider: it is not about us here, but about the chief pastoral office itself; not about this or that personality, but about the bishop! Let no one give ear to me, but to the high dignity!" "But as long as we sit on this chair, as long as we occupy the chief pastoral office: so long have we both the dignity and the power, though we are unworthy of it." As said, fabulous – and their argumentation still today. Still today they catch the masses with it. No, they themselves do not want to be honored. They are quite simple, modest, plain, "also mere human beings". Only God is to be honored in them, and he is greater than all.19

So John had enemies, and his worldly-wise opponent Theophil, not coincidentally called "Amphailax" in Alexandria, played everything possible against him and took away trump after trump. Instead of defending himself, he went on the attack and drove the fight, according to the well-tried way, over to the dogmatic terrain by accusing John of the "heresy" of Origen.

Church Father Epiphanius, the Synod ad Quercum 149

Church Father Epiphanius, the Synod ad Quercum, Murder and Manslaughter in the Patriarchal Palace

In the winter of 402, the Alexandrian sent an inveterate "heresy hunter" after the Constantinople Patriarch, Church Father Epiphanius of Salamis (Constantia) on Cyprus (1163 f). Theophil wrote to him that the Church of Christ had "cut off the head of the serpents of Origen with the sword of the Gospel, and freed the holy host of the Nitrian monks from the pernicious plague. Epiphanius, notorious manufacturer of a "medicine chest for the healing of all heresies", had raised the battle cry against Origen and had taken an early shot at this most controversial theologian of the ancient church – in his "poison cabinet": register number 64; especially since his followers caused Epiphanius trouble in his own district and Origen's* spiritualizing tendency, his symbolic exegesis, seemed obnoxious to him. Even many Catholics meanwhile attest the famous bishop unnervingly low spiritual power, an ardent but

unenlightened zeal – as if the whole Christianity did not originate from the late antique "failure of nerve" (Murray), a lack of thinking power and nerves ...

Already in 390 or 392 the "Patriarch of Orthodoxy" (Nicaea II, 787) had gone to Jerusalem, whose local bishop sympathized with Origen. Epiphanius had fought Origenism in front of an assembled congregation and had implored Archbishop John to leave Origen, "the father of Arius, the root of all heresies". He continued to urge John to unconditionally condemn the "heretic". And Theophil, through Isidore, his old confidant sent to Jerusalem and a convinced Origenist, still sought to mediate at that time; indeed, he supported the Jerusalem bishop in his feud against the monks of Bethlehem, who vainly expected him to condemn Origen. Now, however, the Alexandrian patriarch called the Cyprian metropolitan, previously castigated by him as a "troublemaker" and a "heretic," now the "of all

150 The Struggle for the Episcopal Chairs of the East

Epiphanius hurried by ship from Cyprus, collected signatures against Origen, and incited against John Chrysostom, who was harboring Origen's "heresies". He did all he could to get the patriarch deposed, but then fled from the patriarch's threats and died on the high seas during the voyage home on May 12, 403. At the same time, Theophilus contacted excommunicated prelates of his opponent and worked ruthlessly with slander, bribery, fraud. He sent money to the court clergy and, through Bishop Severian of Gabala and his accomplices, had John's sermons falsified and circulated with all sorts of points at the Empress Eudoxia, in order to use them to defeat the patriarch.²⁰

In the summer of 403, after the successful stirring of his friends and collaborators, Theophilus himself finally appeared at the Golden Horn, not without having declared before his departure, "I am going to the court to depose John." He arrived with 29 Egyptian bishops, an appendix of monks, much gold, an abundance of precious gifts for the emperor's entourage, and descended outside the city in a palace of the already incited Eudoxia – who died of a miscarriage the next year. Then, in weeks of effort, a public scandal, he drew to his side the greater part of the clergy of Constantinople, together with some bishops. The emperor John Chrysostom having in vain ordered the trial of Theophil, the latter in turn opened a council in September at Chalcedon (modern Kadikoy), on the Asiatic shore of the Bosphorus, opposite the capital, in the Palace of Oaks (ad Quercum), recently built by the overthrown Praefectus praetorio Rufinus (p. 14 f), but imperial property since the latter's assassination. The indictment named 29 misdemeanors of the holy church teacher (among others, he had clerics beaten bloody or had them beaten and sold a lot of precious stones et cetera from the church treasury. To these misdemeanors a synodal, Abbot Isaac, added 17 others (among others, the patriarch had the monk John whipped, tied up, and robbed foreign deposits).²¹

The Burning of Hagia Sophia 151

The defendant himself did not appear, but sent three bishops. They were beaten bloody and hung a chain around the neck of one of them, actually intended for John, so that, had he come, he would have been immediately transported by ship. In fact, deposed by the "fathers" after many sessions, he was taken away on a ship in the dark of the night, but a day later he was already rehabilitated. To Eudoxia, a miscarriage appeared as a divine judgment. In triumph they brought back the humiliated one. It is said that there were riots between Constantinopolitans and Alexandrians, bloodshed, the people were looking for Theophilus to throw him into the sea. He disappeared like a fugitive together with his suffragan to Egypt, accompanied also by Abbot Isaac, who obviously feared the return of his opponent. The rest of the Theophilus clique in the capital, however, continued to agitate against John, and Theophilus himself hurled a wild pamphlet

against him. One assassination attempt failed: the servant of the cleric Elpidius, allegedly bribed with 50 gold pieces, stabbed four people to death in the patriarchal palace before he was arrested, but his employers were not prosecuted. Rather, military force was used against John. The emperor refused to

receive communion from him. Robbery, murder and manslaughter continued. Then the regent, more inclined to him, but dependent on Eudoxia and won over by opposing clergy, exiled him forever.

The burning of the Hagia Sophia, the end of John and the "Johannites"

In June 404, while John was being taken away on a ship at night, a special fireworks display was prepared for him: from the sea he saw Hagia Sophia, the church of divine wisdom, burst into flames and with it the magnificent senate palace. (The origin of the fire, which started from the bishop's throne of the cathedral and reduced it to rubble, is still known today.

152 The struggle for the bishop's chairs of the East unsettled. The parties accused each other).

Incidentally, Hagia Sophia, in whose annexes the patriarch resided, was destroyed a second time by the Nika Auḫstand in 532 (p. 383 f), but after each reconstruction became more of a "mystical center of empire and church": a "heaven on earth," a "favored abode of God," overflowing with artistic marvels and relics, but also endowed "with an abundance of goods and possessions for the maintenance of the sanctuary and its clergy" (Beck).²²

In that year when John went into exile, Patriarch Theophil had again addressed an Easter letter against Origen, who "deceived the ears of the simple and credulous with his ingratiating arguments," he had demanded, "Those, then, who wish to celebrate the feast of the Lord must despise the deceptions of Origen"-and unabashedly concluded with the usual hypocrisy, "Let us pray for our enemies, let us be good to those who persecute us." Yes, two years later, when the exiled John dragged himself to his death, the Alexandrian hurled after him a diatribe in which his finished competitor figures as possessed by unclean spirits, as a plague, godless, Judas and Satan, a mad tyrant who gave his soul to the devil, as an enemy of humanity whose crimes even surpassed those of the robbers. "Monstrous," Christians of that time called this pamphlet, "and gruesome because of the ever-repeated curses." ²³

St. Jerome, however, found such frothing abuse of St. John quite splendid-not for nothing did he boast (in an epistle to Theophil) of being "nourished with Catholic milk from the cradle"-yes, he translated the filthy pamphlet. After all, "Pope Theophilus", he certified to him, had "proved with all freedom that Origen is a heretic". He saw to the dissemination of the Alexandrian outpouring of hatred in Rome, and in an accompanying letter to Theophilus praised the latter and himself: "Your writing, as we noted with admiration, will be of use to all churches ... Receive, then, your book, which is also mine, or more properly our book" ²⁴

The best proof, however, that theology was only the cover for church politics, Origen only the pretext for the fight against John Chrysostom, shows the behavior of Theophilus. For no sooner had his adversary been eliminated than he had completely forgotten his antipathy to Origen, the one so venomously heretiated by him for years. "He was often seen absorbed in the reading of Origen, and when astonishment was expressed at this, he used to reply: <The works of Origen are like a meadow in which there are beautiful flowers and some weeds; it only depends that one understands to choose.>""

John's exile was followed by the damnatio memo-riae, the deletion of his name from the diptychs, the official church books of Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople (probably an imitation of state custom).

Three more years of exile, driven from place to place to the farthest corner of the empire, a chronic stomach ailment, frequent fevers, raids by robbers, admittedly also support, help, visits, money enough; and on September 14, 407, death in Komana (Tokat), where formerly flaunted a famous temple of the goddess Anaitis with thousands of priests, hierodules. In one of his exile letters to Olympias, saint of the Greek as well as Latin Church, Chrysostom confessed that he feared no one as much as the bishops, with the exception of a few?⁶

All around, however, a wild persecution of the "Johannites" had already begun, not only in the capital; uncounted arrests, tortures, banishments, fines up to 200 pounds of gold. Hundreds of monks are said to have been massacred by the faithful in Constantinople churches in the autumn of 403, after the

deposition of John; many fled to Italy - "a tragedy that seems all the more grim because it is staged by Catholic bishops" (Benedictine Haacke)?⁷

In his distress, the hunted patriarch (the bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia once sicced an entire horde of monks on him), without acknowledging a primacy of Rome, had in identical

154 The struggle for the bishoprics of the East

the letters appealed to the bishops of Rome, Milan and Aquileia. But three days earlier an urgent messenger from Theophilus had already appeared at the pope's house. Later, a second messenger arrived with a detailed justification of the Alexandrian, in which sentences about Chrysostom were written: "He has murdered the servants of the saints. He is a mangy (contaminatus), godless pestilent, an insane, furious tyrant, who still boasts of his folly, that he has committed his soul to the devil for adultery (adulterandum)!"

Thereupon Innocent I (p. 124 ff) declared in letters of the same wording to both parties to maintain communion with both! With Emperor Honorius he suggested an ecumenical council. But a five-member delegation of the ruler and the pope (among them the bishops Aemilius of Benevento, the leader, Venerius of Milan and Chromatius of Aquileia) was harassed already on its journey in Athens, likewise in Constantinople, not even allowed to appear before Emperor Arcadius, but rather arrested, interned in some forts on the coast and expelled after a futile attempt to bribe them to abandon John Chrysostom and commune with his successor Atticus. Returning after four months, she reported "Babylonian misdeeds." But to the complaining exile himself, who asked the pope for help "as soon as possible," with John invoking "this terrible storm in the Church," the "chaos," Innocent I sent only a letter of consolation, exhorting him to patience and submission to God's will, and extolling the advantage of a good conscience. Innocent's attitude was such that eventually, in many letters from the pope to the emperor (and alleged apologies from him), it was falsified into the opposite.²⁸

Thirty years later, at the end of January 438, Theodosius II had the bones of John Chrysostom solemnly transferred to the Church of the Apostles in Constantinople, from where they came to St. Peter's in Rome in 1204, after the horrific conquest of the city by the Latin Christians. And there, where a large statue commemorates him, they still rest today.²⁹

The Burning of Hagia Sophia 155

The life of a bishop - as not only the fate of John shows - was far more endangered by Christians at that time than perhaps ever before by pagans. No fewer than four bishops of a Phrygian city were murdered in succession by their faithful at the time. And probably the emperor Theodosius, degraded and dispossessed, made the very popular poet and prefect of Constantinople, Flavius Cyrus, whom the people had cheered louder than himself in the racecourse, bishop of that delinquent community of Phrygia by force (though he suspected Cyrus of being a pagan) only because he thought of the end of his four immediate predecessors. Cyrus, however, won the hearts of his fierce flock in flight by extremely short sermons-his inaugural sermon consisted of a single sentence-and resigned his ecclesiastical office in 451, when the climate at court seemed more favorable again.³⁰

Church teacher John Chrysostom was annihilated, Patriarch Theophilus of Alexandria victorious. And his successor and nephew, Church teacher Cyril, openly resisted efforts to rehabilitate St. Chrysostom and remained "convinced of his guilt for a long time" (Library of the Church Fathers). He compared him to Judas and refused to include him in the Alexandrian diptychs, the lists of names of deceased saints read at the Eucharist. Only in 428 did he reluctantly agree to the efforts of the new chief shepherd of Constantinople, Nestorius, to place John's name in the Alexandrian diptycha. I am silent of John, Nestorius apostrophized at the time to his opponent Cyril, "whose ashes you now reluctantly venerate." And then Cyril, using very similar methods copied from his uncle, overthrew this new patriarch of Constantinople.³¹

ij6 The Struggle for the Bishop's Chairs of the East

Patriarch Cyril takes on Patriarch Nestorios

Only a few days after the death of Theophilus, Cyril of Alexandria (412-444) – against his rival, the archdeacon Timothy – ascended the patriarchal chair amid heavy tumult. The saint, who was supposedly guided "not by imperiousness and personal considerations, but only by a sense of duty and zeal for the preservation of the faith" (Cardinal Hergenrother), was in reality a "new Pharaoh", the epitome of the imperious hierarch, was devious and ruthless like no Alexandrian before, not even Demetrius, not even Athanasius. The holy church teacher controlled the Egyptian grain trade and increased his possessions with the help of brutal monk bands. He practiced the worst simony, sold bishoprics to the most evil people. He persecuted the Jews on such a gigantic scale that he can be called the initiator of the first "final solution" without exaggerating. Yes, in 428, his own clergy sued him for violence in Constantinople – for Cyril, of course, merely ruined existences from the "Alexandrian pile of dirt".

The emperor referred the accusers, among them the monk Viktor (p. 194 f), who was particularly impressive to him, to the patriarch of the capital, Nestorios. But Cyril forestalled the trial threatening him, following the noble example of his predecessor and uncle, whose campaigns of destruction against "heresy" and paganism he had witnessed and in whose infamous "Synod of the Oaks" (403), which overthrew John Chrysostom, he himself had already participated. The autonomy efforts of his Constantinople colleague and competitor displeased him anyway, and so he, like his predecessor Theophilus (and his successor Dioskor: p. 116 ff), continued the fight against the patriarchate of the capital to preserve his own supremacy. When Nestorios, probably at the emperor's request, was to sit in judgment on him, Cyril, he accused Nestorios of "heresy." He imputed bad and perverse views to him. He claimed that he

Patriarch Cyril takes on Patriarch Nestorios 157 had "given offense to the whole Church and instilled in the peoples the leaven of a new and strange heresy." In short, following the tried and tested tactics of his predecessor and master Athanasius, as well as of his uncle Theophilus, he immediately transferred the rivalry in church politics, the struggle for power, to the religious sphere – all the more easily, since theological antagonisms had long existed between the Alexandrian and Antiochian schools, from which Nestorios came; a follower, probably even a disciple, of Bishop Theodore of Mopsuestia, who had shaped the extreme Antiochian Christology.³¹

Nestorios, with whom – it sounds promising! – "the classical period of Christological struggles" begins (Grillmeier SJ), that is, a two-and-a-half-century-long, as it were, worldwide struggle for arms, was born of Persian parents in Germanicia (Marasch, Syria) after 381. His life reminds in some respects of that of his predecessor John. Nestorios had been a monk in the Euprepios monastery near Antioch and had been made a priest "because he had a beautiful voice and could speak well" (church historian Socrates), but otherwise, according to Wetzer/Weltes old "Lexikon der katholischen Theologie", "without higher spiritual education. Seen from the outside, his change was exemplary. He rarely went out among the people, sat at home over books, and gave himself the appearance of a man of strict morals through his clothing, emaciation and pallor. As a result, he became widely famous in a short time." ³³ As once Chrysostom, Nestorios, because of his preaching fame, arrived at the episcopal see of Constantinople by Theodosius, eliminating other candidates, on April 10, 4x8. He immediately spoke out against Jews and "heretics", but spared the Pelagians, which did not earn him the sympathy of Rome. There was unrest throughout the patriarchate, and bloodshed here and there. "Give me, O Emperor, the earth cleansed of heretics, and I will give You heaven in return. Destroy with me the heretics, and I will destroy with thee the Persians!" Thus Nestorios already cried out in his inaugural sermon

158 The struggle for the episcopal chairs of the East and ruthlessly attacked Christians of other faiths, schismatics, "heretics," the Novatians, Apollinarists and other "sects." Only five days after his ordination he had the church of the Arians destroyed, where they prayed secretly. When it went up in flames, the neighboring houses also burned. He fought just as fanatically against the Macedonians or Pneumatomachs, whom he deprived of their prayer halls in the capital and on the Hellespont – "a magniloquent enemy of heretics," says Har-nack, "a careless daredevil, but not an ignoble man ...". And the emperor gave even more emphasis to the pogroms of his patriarch by an intensified penal law of May 30, 4x8.34

Soon, however, Nestorios himself came to be known as a "heretic."

This was ensured by Cyril, for whom the rival in the capital obviously seemed far too important and influential. Thus, continuing the old feud of the two patriarchal sees, Cyril sought to bring down Nestorios as wickedly as his predecessor and uncle had brought down John Chrysostom.

As always in such matters, a theological cause was quickly found, which, although it soon moved the Church of the East and West, by its nature need not have moved at all. What fueled it, however, was, according to Erich Caspar, only "the lurking hatred and relentless will to destroy, with which Cyril pursued and hunted down the opponent". But even a dogma historian like Reinhold Seeberg emphasizes that Cyril was hardly urged by theological differences to fight against Nestorios and the Antiochian doctrine represented by him, which until then had also been considered equal, but by personal differences and above all by church-political concerns, the constant struggle with Antioch and even more with Constantinople. The position of power of the Alexandrian archbishop was only comparable to that of the Roman archbishop, but distant from Rome and, moreover, always more or less connected with Alexandria since the Council of Nicaea. Antioch and the emerging capital, however, were closer, and Constantinople in particular had to be bowed to, whereby

The Antiochian and Alexandrian schools of theologians_____ 159

Cyril repeating the very same tragedy that his uncle and predecessor had enacted against John Chrysostom, now against Nestorios. "But if Theophilus," says Seeberg, "had accused his opponent of Origenism because he protected the Origenists whom he persecuted, Cyril himself made his opponent's doctrine heresy, and thus achieved not only that the bishop of Constantinople became heretic, but also that the theology of Antioch became suspect. This was a political masterstroke, because it hit both rivals of Alexandria with equal force. It was in accordance with the ecclesiastical-political tradition that Cyril sought and found the alliance of Rome in these battles. To this policy Antiochian theology succumbed. "35

The Antiochian and Alexandrian Schools of Theology.

In the 4th century, in the controversy over the complicated nature of God, the problem of the nature of the "Father" and the "Son" and their relation to each other, the full deity of the "Son," his consubstantiality with the "Father," had been fought for against Arianism with all the power of the state, and at last enforced by a word of power from the emperor Theodosius I on February 28, 380 (I 351 ff). "In an ineffable way, the native sprang from the essence of the Father, perfuming us with the whole nature of the Creator within him..." formulates Cyril poetically. And St. Ambrose astutely comments on the biblical word: "Let there be lights in the firmament of heaven for the illumination of the earth!" (Gen. 1:14): "Who speaks this? God speaks it. And to whom else does he speak it but to the Son?" Another proof of the dogma of the Church!36

In the 5th century, however – for if it is madness, it has method – it went on in the times and generations stultifying

i6o The struggle for the bishop's chairs of the East

the "Christological" spectacle, fought out with almost every kind of intrigue and violence, was about

the question, the great "mystery": How do the "divine" and "human" natures of Christ relate to each other? Even if this parochial spawn had existed: could such a literally bottomless mystery be grasped rationally or with whatever human soul power? The experts were then again completely divided. And again the whole population of the Eastern Roman Empire took a lively interest (cf. I 357).

According to the Antiochian school of theologians, which was undoubtedly closer to the Bible, which started from the "historical" Jesus of the Gospels, from man, and the independent existence of a human nature before its union with the Son of God, there were two separate natures in Christ side by side.

According to the Alexandrian doctrine, which started from the Logos, from a Son of God who assumed human nature, "divine" and "human" nature were united in him without any rest. One called this "hypostatic union", this "communicatio idiomatum" in the old church more or less exactly (– aside that there was of course nothing exact at all and could exist!): *mixtio*, *commixtio*, *concursus*, *unio*, *connexio*, *copulatio*, *coitio et cetera*. For the Antiochians, the "realists", the unification of the two natures was merely a psychological one, for the Alexandrians, the "idealists", "mystics", it was a metaphysical–ontological one. The Antiochian direction was also represented in its more moderate form by the church teacher John Chrysostom, the Alexandrian direction was advocated by the church teacher Cyril, its actual founder. The beginnings of the latter, however, were already evident in Athanasius, for example in his sentence: "It was not man who later became God, but God who became man in order to deify us. So instead of the Arian schism, one now had the Monophysite one, which was to shake state and society far longer and worse, to harm them far more than the invasion of the "barbarians", the migration of peoples.³⁷

The Struggle for the "Mother of God" Begins 161

The Struggle for the "Mother of God" Begins

Nestorios came from Antioch and was a representative of the Antiochian school. He energetically wanted to enforce the "right" thing by all means in Constantinople, where there was an excited discussion about the Mother of God, and he did this completely in the sense of the Antiochians. Sensing Apollinarism or Photinianism, he used phrases that suggested (perhaps unintentionally) a certain dualism in the person of Christ. So he taught a "heretical" Christology for the Alexandrian Cyril, who at the end of 428, without mentioning Nestorios by name, clearly declared himself against him. Cyril, however, who was basically not concerned with the Christological

issue that he had brought into focus, made the dogmatic distance between him and Nestorios larger and sharper than it really was. Yes, he imputed to the latter, against his better knowledge, the doctrine that Christ consists of two distinct persons, "which neither," writes Johannes Haller, "Nestorios nor any of his followers ever asserted. Thus Cyril betrayed that it was not the zeal for or against a doctrine that drove him to fight, but that – as in all similar cases sooner or later – the doctrinal dispute had to serve as occasion and weapon to open an ecclesiastical power struggle and to destroy a feared rival." ³⁸

And none other than the French Dominican Pierre–Thomas Camelot, patrologist, historian of dogma and advisor to the Second Vatican Council, seems to agree with Haller, as the Catholic concedes – with ecclesiastical permission to print: "The Bishop of Alexandria had to watch how his reputation dwindled more and more before that of the <New Rome>, to which the Council of Constantinople had given an honorary primacy in 381. And so it is only too understandable [!] that Alexandria now made an attempt to intervene in the ecclesiastical affairs of the capital. So it had already been with Peter of Alexandria, who supported the usurper Maximus against Gregory of Nazianzus; likewise one need only recall the role of

i6z The struggle for the episcopal chairs of the East that Theophilus had played in deposing John Chrysostom ("Oak Synod" 403). >>3'

However, according to Camelot's findings, which further incriminate Cyril: the saint "does not fare

well" in comparison with the tragedy of Nestorius; it must be "well acknowledged that some traits of Cyril's character seem in some measure to justify Nestorius and his contemporary and modern followers"; it must also be "not denied that he sometimes lacked that "moderation" which his opponent preached to him"; that his "high-handed intervention in the affairs of Constantinople ... astonish us, some intrigues even become a nuisance to us", after such concessions, more correct accusations, Camelot – in contradiction to the power-political motive admitted only one page before, namely Cyril's "more and more" diminishing prestige towards his rival – seems to be "sure of one thing, however": Whatever character traits Cyril may have had, he was guided only [!] by concern for the truth and zeal for the faith. Nothing in the texts [!] probably justifies the accusation of a domineering nature, nowhere shows the intention to provide Alexandria the supremacy over Constantinople, to overwhelm and destroy his opponent. Certainly ...", the Dominican continues immediately afterwards. And: "Certainly he was hard against Nestorius". But, he triumphs, in the negotiations of 433 Cyril "knew how to show moderation and, for the sake of peace, to refrain from dear but contestable formulations".⁴⁰

In reality, of course, this very moderation, this seemingly so surprising concession, is further, even particularly glaring evidence of Cyril's real motive, his power politics. For in 433, hardly after Nestorius was finished, the victor in the absurd Christological theater stepped in (p. 189 ff). He now had nothing to fear from Nestorius and the dogmatic mirror fencing never moved him as such primarily. The union of the two natures of the Lord certainly did not touch a man of his ilk in his innermost being, if at all. It was above all a means to an end; was

The struggle for the "Mother of God" begins 163 to him, often recurring words, "inexpressible and indescribable" – and yet his peers spoke and wrote about it constantly through the centuries.

Today, however, not so easily.

How a catholic theologian in the meantime has to twist his head, how he on the one hand constantly has to squint at research, on the other hand constantly has to squint at the teaching authority, the own authority, and then has to agree with it, that Camelot already says on the third page of his introduction to "Ephesus and Chalcedon" (cf. my own, especially I 16 f, 54 ff) quite unashamedly. For, he says, the historian can certainly "not overlook the passions and interests that guide people, just as little as the often quite regrettable incidents" (incident pagan extermination, for example; incident witch burning; incident Indian extermination; Incident People's Dumbing Down and Fleecing; Incident Bartholomew's Night; Incident Thirty Years' War; Incident First World War and Second and Fascism and Auschwitz and Vietnam and and and, history is made up of incidents), "through which the earthly pilgrimage of the Church passes . But he", the historian, "must not stare as if hypnotized only at these miseries in history, but must look at things from a higher point of view, if he does not want to get a too narrow and incomplete, not to say biased, view of the course of events".⁴¹

Unbiased is only the one who fixes the course of events with the "bias" of this church, from its "higher point of view", with a completely obfuscating, falsifying, yes, often enough completely upside down perspective and distance, sub specie aeternitatis. Whereby one makes then gladly from black white, from white black – see the 13th rule of the Jesuit order! –, so that just no longer "these miseries in history" decide, but the aspects of the "higher point of view"! Here and again the question arises: What actually gives these people the "courage" for their monstrosities?

164 The Struggle for the Bishop's Chairs of the East

things? And again and again, since they are not ignorant, the answer is: a disgusting mixture of a lack of spiritual honesty and overflowing spiritual opportunism, all in all a frightening deficit of shame.

"Even the great figures of Cyril and Leo the Great must be put in perspective . . ." ²

Must! Exactly ... And the "right light" is the darkest on earth.

Nestorius thus represented for Cyril a "heretical" Christology, in that he, allegedly, denied the

"hypostatic union" and taught two hypostases (merely morally, psychologically or externally) joined in the "Lord" - instead of, like Cyril, only one hypostasis or physis, "the one incarnate nature of the divine Word" (Mia physis tou theou logou sesarkomene). Whereby church teacher Cyril curiously refers the repeatedly before him used Mia physis formula in the opinion, it originates from Athanasius, from bishop Apollinaris of Laodicea, a friend indeed of church teacher Athanasius, the passionate opponent of Arianism, whose denial led him, Apollinaris, however, to deny also the full human nature of Christ and to recognize only one nature in him, what made the Athanasius friend just a "heretic". "This man," writes Adalbert Hamman with ecclesiastical printing permission from Cyril, "was of the inhuman orthodoxy of an inquisitor," and shortly afterwards adds almost grotesquely, "and yet he allowed himself to be misled by the erroneous formulas of Apollinaris, believing them to have come from Athanasios, and possessed the tactlessness to try to impose them on Nestorius. An opponent of equal intransigence, interpreting the twelve anathematisms of Cyril verbatim, would easily have been able to inflict on them the same fate that the latter inflicted on the utterances of Nestorius." Indeed, the Monophysites soon invoked Cyril's authority. And as for Nestorius, the Catholic theologian and church historian Ehrhard attests to his theory, after all, that it was "in a very similar way" to the doctrine of The struggle for the "Mother of God" begins 165 of Arius was suitable "to satisfy the <reasonable> thinking. He also pursued the goal of eliminating objections of Jews and pagans against the deity of Christ in the most plausible way."

Consistent with this, Nestorios also did not want to make the Blessed Virgin Mary a goddess or deity. He did not want her to be called "woman-bearer of men", but he did not want her to be called "Mother of God", "God-bearer" (Theotokos), a designation that does not occur even once in the extensive work (the greatest of all ancient church writers of the East) of the church teacher John Chrysostom, who also came from the Antiochian school, which cannot be a coincidence. Nestorios, whose first measures included the insertion of the name of his overthrown predecessor, St. John, into the church prayer, virtually castigated the idea of a deity wrapped in swaddling clothes as a pagan fable, which it actually was! Since the end of 428 he preached against the Theotokos, although he did not oppose at all the "rightly understood" use of the term, occasionally even using it himself; but he preferred the title "Mother of Christ", "Christ-bearer" (Christotokos). He feared the word "God-bearer" as a misunderstanding. For would not this make Mary a goddess in the eyes of many? And how, asks Nestorios, who here, so he writes to the Roman bishop Coelestine I (422-432), notices a "not small corruption of the true faith", could God still have a mother? No one would give birth to someone older than himself. God, however, was older than Mary.

This, however, only confused his congregation, especially those "who, in their blindness to the true vision of the Incarnation of God, do not understand what they are saying nor what they are zealous for. Only recently he had heard again how they asked each other's soul out of their bodies in our midst. But if God has a mother, Nestorios concludes, "then of course the pagan deserves no reproach when he talks about mothers of the gods. And Paul is a liar when he calls Christ's deity 'fatherless,

166 The Struggle for the Episcopal Chairs of the East

motherless, without genealogy." My dear friend, Mary did not give birth to the Godhead ..the created being is not mother of Him who is uncreated..the creature did not give birth to the Creator, but to man, who was the instrument of the Godhead -. So much logic, however, irritated the flock, the "wretched band", as the patriarch also said, against whom he called out the police, whom he had whipped and imprisoned. Many laymen and monks had just begun to venerate Mary as the God-bearer and in general effusively - although the New Testament mentions her only extremely rarely, without any special appreciation, or ignores her completely, like Paul and other writings. And although the New Testament clearly speaks of Jesus' siblings as children of Mary, as still much later for example Tertullian. But the

big bunch wanted to be "redeemed"! Wanted a whole God! So also his mother had to be "God's mother", especially since such God's mothers were already known in paganism – in Egypt, Babylon, Persia or Greece, where for example also the mother of Alexander the Great was "God's mother". Cyril, however, who, to emphasize this once again, was not driven into battle with Nestorios "by dogmatic opposition", attacked the latter's undoubtedly more traditional recommendation as a new "heresy". He thereby "with skillful refinement presented the personal charges against him as a triviality disappearing next to the faith controversy" (Schwartz) and made the keyword "Mother of God" the mark of the true faith. He ingratiated himself in Rome with his "most holy and God-loving father" Coelestine I – "for God requires of us vigilance in these matters" – and, familiar with all the finesses of church politics, outwardly seemingly distinguished, prudent, but secretly obsessed, stirred up the agitation against Nestorios. In the process, through his agents in Constantinople, he spread the rumor that Nestorios shied away from the word "Mother of God" because he did not believe in Jesus' divinity.⁴³

A good two decades before Coelestine, another pope had been strangely discreet about the "Mother of God."

The battle over the "Mother of God" begins 167

At the end of the 4th century, Bishop Bonosus of Sardica denied Mary's constant virginity and declared, in conformity with the Gospel, that Mary had given birth to several sons in addition to Jesus; a thesis that, although biblically validated, was highly heretical in ecclesiastical terms. The Synod of Capua (391), however, did not condemn Bonosus, but entrusted the decision to the neighboring bishops, who, of course, also avoided it. They consulted the Bishop of Rome, Siricius, who defended Mary's permanent virginity, but again did not make an arbitration. He left this to his "colleagues" – all the more striking because Siricius in particular otherwise commanded on all sides and almost in imperial epistolary style (p. 124). Probably his reticence simply reflects the fact that no cult of Mary had yet been officially known in Rome in the 4th century.⁴⁴

In any case, the title "God-bearer" is absent from early Christian literature. It is nowhere found in the New Testament, which speaks only of the Mother of the Lord, but merely as Son of God, not as God-bearer. This term for Mary is also missing in the entire Christian literature of the 2nd and 3rd century, when she still did not play a special role. (The theo-tokos predicate in Aristides apol. 2,7 is only in the Armenian translation. And in Hippolytus it is likewise later ingredient, that is, forgery). It is only in the twenties of the 4th century that the Theotokos titlature – according to Camelot "long common in Christian usage", without his being able to name a sure witness before the 4th century! – is attested in the Creed of Alexandria by the bishop Alexander. And also the Synod of Antioch (324/325), summarizing the Tomos of Alexander, writes: "the Son of God, the Logos, is born of the God-bearer (theotokos) Mary ..." Yet, many decades later, to note this again, even Doctor of the Church John Chrysostom never uses the word "God-bearer" in his giant work and, moreover, speaks of Mary remarkably rarely.⁴⁵

Other bishops also shied away as late as the 5th century,

i68 The Struggle for the Episcopal Chairs of the East to dub her so. Even Sixtus III (432–440), who soon after 431 completed the magnificent basilica of S. Maria Maggiore on the Esquiline, the first Roman church of Mary and for a long time the only one. referred to Jesus' mother–despite Ephesus–in a dedicatory inscription only as "Virgin Mary." And about twenty other Roman Marian churches were always called simply "Santa Maria". In general, the cult of the Mother of God spread only slowly, especially in the West.⁴⁶

The title "God-bearer" could also have risky consequences. Didn't it bring Mary close to pagan goddesses and mothers of the gods? Didn't a woman who gave birth to a god have to be a deity herself?

Not only simple believers liked to believe this, even educated people were susceptible to it. In fact, there were already Marian sects, there was a branch of Montanists who called Mary "goddess", there were Christian groups who saw in Mary and Christ two deities besides God. As early as Nicaea, the Alexandrian patriarch Eutychios (d. 944) claims, patriarchs and bishops met who believed "Christ and his mother were two gods besides God; they were barbarians, and they were called Marianites." ⁴⁷ Curious that both Nestorios and Cyril refer to the fides Nicaena, "the holy and great council," in their dispute. They therefore exchange 42.9/430-while the Vandals land in Africa, then besiege Hippo, the Huns advance to the Rhine-a series of letters with each other and with others. In the very first letter Nestorios justifies the rejection of the title Theotokos by its absence in the Nicene Creed. Cyril, however, appeals to this very fact, reproaches his "brother in office in the Lord" for "blasphemies," a "nuisance" he gave "to the whole Church," the spreading of "an unusual and strange false doctrine," and announces to him the "intolerable wrath of God." Nestorios passes over "the invectives you hurled against us in your astonishing letter. You also demand the patience of a physician ..." He accuses Cyril of "only superficial" reading and wants to "rid him of all false talk." Nor is he full of optimism or does little-.

The struggle for the "Mother of God" begins 169

sten like this. "For the affairs of the Church are developing more favorably from day to day . . ." ⁴⁸ Cyril cannot deny that the "God-bearer" is missing from the fides Nicaena, but finds it there indirectly, threatening Christ's word in the face of the adversary's writings spread everywhere: "Do not think that I have come to bring peace to the world; it was not peace that I wished to bring, but the sword." And because Nestorios had "misunderstood and misinterpreted" the Council of Nicaea, Cyril demands: "You must therefore confess in writing and under oath that you banish your wicked and godless doctrines, and think and teach as we all do, who are bishops, teachers and leaders of the people in the East and West". ⁴⁹

In every possible way Cyril works against the patriarch in Constantinople, of whom he scoffs that he "thinks himself wiser than all," that he thinks "he alone has grasped the meaning of the divinely inspired Scriptures, the mystery of Christ." He calls him "swollen in arrogance and by virtue of his chair hostile to all others." Cyril hoarded the pearls of the Fathers of the Church as well as the texts of his adversary's sermons, which were suitable for him, and soon every speech of his was written down and sent by express mail to Alexandria. The saint wrote five books "Against the blasphemies of Nestorios". He distorted the latter in confidential letters in such a way that no concession helped. He sent forward clusters of monks as shock troops. He agitated feverishly on all sides. In East and West he sought allies, comrades-in-arms, of course as influential as possible. He flooded the court with his epistles. He wrote (carefully) to Emperor Theodosius, to Empress Eudokia, the princesses Arcadia and Marina, sharply to the emperor's sister Pulcheria, whose tense relationship with Nestorios he obviously knew. He addressed bishops, Juvenal in Jerusalem, Acacius of Berea, who was almost a hundred and ten years old, and last but not least, in the summer of 430, Coelestine of Rome, to whom he enclosed a collected patristic flower reading together with an account (commonitorium) of the opponent's "heresy." ⁵⁰

170 The Struggle for the Bishop's Chairs of the East

Nestorios, when he made contact with Rome - as an equal, which must have already displeased them - had wanted to discuss theology objectively, so to speak, and to fight with the brother bishop "in harmony...the devil, the enemy of peace," seeing, as he wrote to the pope, "a heretical disease breaking out among his own clergy, which stinks very much of Apollinaris and Arius." But he soon recognized the Roman, quite correctly, as "far too simple-minded to be able to penetrate the finer meaning of doctrinal truths." Cyril, on the other hand, initially unpopular with his Eastern colleagues because of his attack, knew how to approach Rome more skillfully, although this was by no means pleasant to him in

principle. "Most Holy and God-loving Father," he apostrophized the pope, claiming, "ecclesiastical custom commands me to report to Your Highness. I have hitherto observed profound silence.... But now that the evil has reached its climax, I believe I must speak and communicate all that has happened..." And against his better knowledge, Cyril, who also presented his agitation against Nestorios in Latin, which the latter refrained from doing, presented the teachings of his opponent in such a slanderous, distorted way that he "would not have recognized himself" (Aland). All the light fell on him, all the shadow on Nestorios/1.

Already in the interest of its primacy pretensions, Rome received with satisfaction the first contact attempt of the Alexandrian in the summer of 430. And although theological disputes always moved it much less than questions of power, it nevertheless

learned to master power by means of doctrine. So now the deacon Leo, later pope, sought an expert opinion (for refutation, of course) from his friend John Cassianus, the abbot of St. Victor in Marseilles. He had lived in Constantinople at the time of Chrysostom, knew Greek and found the title "God-bearer" (mater Dei and genetrix Dei) already in the Bible! ' And with a Roman synod of n. August 430 Coelestine I decided, so to speak, summarily, "without closer examination of the documents" (Hamman, with imprimatur), against Nestorios. The pope graciously authorized Cyril in his place (vice nostra

The Struggle for the "Mother of God" Begins 171 usus) to strike down "with great severity" the "false doctrine" of Nestorios, the "poison of his preaching," and at about the same time sharply rebuked Nestorios, even demanding of him within ten days to recant "openly and in writing the deceptive novelty." "We prepare," he threatened him, "branding irons and knives, since the wounds are no longer to be favored, which deserve to be cut." Cyril, on the other hand, saw the Roman "like-minded with us in everything," "tried as a vigorous defender of the right faith," praised, "All the snares of the doctrine of lies you have uncovered," and encouraged, "Cut out such a swarm So perform ..."

And Cyril carried out. He continued to gather material against Nestorios, continued to be less than truthful, and deliberately attributed false doctrines to the man who also recognized Mary's title of "Mother of God" as thoroughly orthodox. The emperor accused Cyril of "quarrelsomeness" and "confusion" and warned him: "Know then that church and state are absolutely one and that they are becoming more and more united by our command and with the providence of our God and Savior ..., and we will not tolerate under any circumstances that cities and churches are put into unrest by you". Theodosius was on the side of the one he appointed to Constantinople. And Nestorios was also protected by Empress Eudokia, the daughter of an Athenian philosopher, who was as beautiful as she was educated. But the patriarch already had many enemies, especially in Constantinople, most notably the ruler's scheming older sister, Pulcheria (399–453), whose secret violations of her vow of virginity Nestorios criticized and who, at Eudocia's insistence, was forced to leave the court in 439. Further, various sects opposed the patriarch, whom he fought to the point of bloodshed. Also numerous monks of the capital under the abbot Dalmatios fought for Cyril, stirred up the mood on his behalf and blurted out lies about Nestorios; for example, that he was the herald of two sons of God, two hypostāseis in Christ, seeing in Jesus only a man, nothing more. Thus the afflicted man hastened to speak about Theodosius for

i72 The struggle for the bishoprics of the East

Pentecost 431 to have an imperial synod summoned to Ephesus, the capital of the province of Asia, not suspecting that this very thing would bring him down.⁵²

The Council of Ephesus 431 or a Dogma by Bribery

In 1931, when Pope Pius XL decreed the 1500th anniversary of the Council of Ephesus, he lied in his encyclical "Lux veritatis" that the council had come about by papal command (lusu Romani Pontificis

Caele-stini I). In fact, however, the holding of imperial synods since Nicaea was always ordered by the Roman emperor, never by the Roman bishop! Not a single one of the eight ecumenical councils in early church times, which were only later appointed by the church because they were particularly useful to it, was called, opened, presided over and confirmed by the "pope", but each one (more or less directly) by the emperor (cf. p. 80 f.). The imperial right of appointment has long been proven, especially by F. X. Funk. But the regents did not only arrogate this right to themselves, the church conceded it to them "also without further ado" (H.-G. Beck). And the same, incidentally, applies to their right to preside over synods, even smaller ones, the patriarchal synods, the local church assemblies, personally or through representatives, to sign their resolutions and to make them legally binding. The monarchs were able to influence the faith and discipline of these meetings by choosing the place or the participants, and they even had formulas of faith worked out and enforced – and no less a person than the church teacher Pope Leo I recognized the emperor's infallibility (p. Z54 f)!⁵³

The Council of Ephesus was also convened by Theodosius II on November 19, 430, at Pentecost (June 7) 431, to consolidate the peace and tranquility of the Church–although these councils usually had the opposite effect. "The good of our kingdom," wrote

The Council of Ephesus 431 173

the emperor, who had been hostile to Cyril from the beginning, accusing him of arrogance, quarrelsomeness, scheming, "depends on religion. These two goods are closely related to each other. They interpenetrate each other, and each derives its benefit from the growth of the other ... Above all else, however, We strive for respect for the affairs of the Church to the extent that God requires....",⁵⁴

The imperial letter of convocation shows the close connection between the empire and religion. Each was dependent on the other, each hoped to profit from it. And that the Church in particular could never get enough is most clearly demonstrated by Bishop Coelestine's letter of May 8, 431 to Theodosius II: "The cause of faith must be more important to you than that of the Empire: Your Majesty must be more concerned about the peace of the churches than about the security of the whole earth. All things will prosper you, if only that is first preserved which is more precious in the sight of God."⁵⁵

One can hardly reflect enough on these lines – a mirror of Roman Catholic thinking through the ages until today (as, for example, the atomic bomb policy of influential clerical circles, including Pope Pius XII, drastically teaches). First and foremost comes what is more valuable: the Church. Her cause is more important than that of the Empire; her peace, that is her advantage, nothing else, more important than "the security of the whole earth"! Triumphant, Jesuit Hugo Rahner comments: "Supremacy of the ecclesiastical over the state .."⁵⁶

All the metropolitans of the East had been invited to Ephesus, as well as those of the West, including Rome's Bishop Coelestine, who sent legates, including Augustine, of whose death, four months earlier, the court had not yet known.

Nestorios was the first to arrive with sixteen bishops, accompanied by an escort of soldiers, "as if going into battle" (Hefele); though the soldiers were still "the most peaceable among the assembled fighting cocks" (Dallmayr). The patriarch, of course, later refused with six or seven chief shepherds to appear before the synod before all were assembled. Likewise

i74 The struggle for the episcopal chairs of the East

present: local bishop Memnon, who sided with Cyril with all his churches; also the episcopate of Asia Minor, which sought to break away from Constantinople's domination. Juvenal of Jerusalem, arriving with about fifteen Palestinian prelates, an ambitious opportunist who sought an upper metropolitan position and his independence from Antioch, also stood by Cyril from the start. The latter himself had come by ship and had already reported home from Rhodus: "By the grace and philanthropy of Christ, who is the Savior of us all, we have crossed this great and wide sea on gentle and mild winds .."⁵⁷

Contrary to imperial orders, Cyril had shown up with formidable household power, with a swarm of some fifty Egyptian suffragans, many clerics, as well as quarrelsome hordes of monks, illiterate in part, yet strong in faith. The beating guards of the Alexandrian patriarchs, which originally consisted of loiterers, sick-bearers, and shipmen, had been the compliant tools of episcopal power politics since Athanasius (I ch. 8). Highly fanatical and sparing no excesses, they terrorized courts, authorities and their own ecclesiastical opponents. Everywhere, the monasticism, which had been pampered and controlled by the high clergy, worked "with the most brutal means on the incitement of the masses" (Stein). Also the local bishop Memnon had turned the people of Ephesus against Nestorios, closed all churches to him; Cyril himself had not only, already in 430, written five books "Adversus Nestorii blasphemias", not only, in the same year, hurled out three more pamphlets, "De recta fide", one to Emperor Theodosius, two, "Ad reginas", to his three sisters Arcadia, Marina, Pulcheria, as well as to Empress Eudokia, but he had also already condemned the "enemy of the Holy Virgin" along with his alleged theses in twelve anathematisms, exchanging the role of the accused with that of the plaintiff. He treated Nestorios as a declared "heretic" - an illegal step, since according to the valid imperial church law only a synod appointed by the emperor was allowed to decide a religious dispute.

The Council of Ephesus 431 175

Moreover, Nestorios had declared in several letters that under certain conditions he would also recognize the title of God-bearer, the Theoto-kos, for Mary, and had written, for example, to the Roman bishop: "As far as I am concerned, I am not against those who want to use the word Theotokos, as long as it is not interpreted in imitation of the folly of Apollinaris and Arius as if it meant a mixture of natures".⁵⁸

The council could not begin on schedule on June 7 because Patriarch John of Antioch - traveling for weeks by arduous land routes, with several chief shepherds falling ill, several beasts of burden perishing - and the bishops of Syria and Palestine were late. But although (or because) a message from John on June 21 promised his imminent arrival, Cyril decided to get started. It was hot,

several bishops fell ill here too, some even died, and even before the multitude devoted to Nestorios was present, Cyril opened the synod on his own initiative on June 22, 431, in the main church of Ephesus, already some time ago transformed into a church of St. Mary - despite the explicit prohibition of the government; despite the (in the Greek council records suppressed!) of 68 bishops of various provinces, "that all the rash deeds of which some have made bold will be turned against their audacity and presumption by Christ the Lord and the divine canons"; despite the protest also repeatedly raised by the representative of the emperor, the commissioner Candidian, who feared a "private council", until he was finally "imperiose et violenter" sent to the door. Cyril thus obtained a secure majority in the simplest way. And subsequently it was given the rank of a "third ecumenical council of Ephesus". Later the saint, who unscrupulously took over everything, claimed that a few Syrian bishops had rushed ahead of their colleagues, had been in the city earlier and had asked him, Cyril, in the name of Patriarch John, who had protested against him and voted against him! - Patriarch John, only to immediately start the synod.

176 The struggle for the bishop's chairs of the East to begin. Even to Camelot the data enclosed by Cyril "cause some difficulty.... But before questioning Cyril's honesty, it would be better to remember that he did not remember things precisely or that he confused them" ... - And don't we experience it so often today that politicians can no longer remember? That the Church in particular simply no longer remembers the most important things? Or that they confuse their collaboration with Hitler, with Mussolini, with Pavelic with resistance? Nothing new under the sun.

Cyril presided over 153 bishops and also represented, according to the minutes of the meeting, "the place of Coelestine, the holy and venerable bishop of the Church of the Romans". For Cyril did not

wait for the arrival of his legates, the bishops Arcadius and Projectus and the presbyter Philip. First they read many golden words of the Fathers about the Incarnation of the Logos, the union of the Godhead and humanity in the one Christ. Then they effectively confronted twenty selected passages of Nestorius, terrible "blasphemies", which attacked the bishop Palladius of Amasia in such a way that he covered his orthodox ears, almost rigid with consternation. Thereupon, one after the other, often quite noisily, they condemned the accursed "heretic", for Eupotius of Ptolemais "worthy of any punishment by God and man". And Cyril had the "godless Nestorius", the preacher of "godless doctrines", excommunicated on the very first day of the session – he had wisely stayed away –, deposed and informed about everything by address: "To Nestorius, the new Judas". The synodal members, according to the formal decision, "with many tears, came to this sad judgment about him: the Lord Jesus Christ, blasphemed by him, therefore determined, through the most holy synod present, that Nestorius be excluded from the whole priestly assembly, stripped of his episcopal dignity". But "that Nestorius was unjustly condemned as a heretic is today, probably, the unanimous judgment of the historians of dogma" (Kiauser). And just as well that Cyril's action was "ingloriously distinguished by the greatest ruthlessness" (Schwaiger).

The Council of Ephesus 431 177

While Nestorius's soldiers had to protect, Cyril had himself celebrated frenetically, with torches and censers, a direction as rascally as it was successful.⁵

Rejoicing, he reports to the clergy and people of Alexandria – "Hail to the Lord!" – of this 22. June, "that after a session lasting all day, we finally punished the unfortunate Nestorius with deposition and removed him from the episcopate. He had been condemned and had not even dared to face the holy synod. There were more than two hundred bishops assembled" – a considerable exaggeration of the saint. The council judgment bears the signature of 197 bishops, but there were only "about 150 bishops" (Camelot; so does the "Handbook of Church History").⁶⁰

Cyril goes on to tell his own that all of Ephesus awaited the verdict of the "holy synod" from dawn to dusk, and then unanimously began to congratulate the "holy synod" and praise God "because the enemy of the faith was crushed." After leaving the church, they were escorted with torches to their homes, he said. "Festivities of joy and illuminations took place throughout the city. Women even went so far as to walk before us with censers of incense! The Lord has shown his omnipotence to those who blaspheme his name."⁶¹

It is striking: in this whole letter there is not a syllable about the proclamation of Mary's motherhood, which was supposedly the point! In fact, this was not defined at all. The Council texts do not contain any explicit definition of the Theotokos! "Such definitions did not exist at all in Ephesus", emphasizes the Council chronicler and adviser of the Second Vatican Council, Camelot – but soon afterwards concludes his account: "In Ephesus this at the same time human and divine history led to a dogmatic definition, in which it was about the highest religious values and the whole realism [!] of our salvation". This shows once more that with the character of Catholic theologians also their logic goes to the devil. And that the likes of him have one head only to twist the other. (Incidentally, beautifully said: this at the same time human

178 The struggle for the bishop's chairs of the East and divine history!) Pope Pius XI repeatedly spoke of a solemn definition (solemniter decretum) of Mary's motherhood when he announced the Ephesian play. But someone – the Holy Spirit perhaps – must have enlightened him then. His encyclical "Lux veritatis." (what mockery!) of December 25, 1931, no longer contains any reference to a definition! Instead, Pius now explains the dogma of the Motherhood of God only as a consequence of the doctrine of the "hypostatic union", which, of course, was not conceptually formulated at that time either.⁶² For Cyril, the one as well as the other had in any case secretly no great importance. That is why his letter consistently speaks only of his own adulation and that of his followers – and of the destruction of

the "heretic," the feared rival, to whom it was written: "The holy synod, by the grace of God and by command of our most pious and most holy emperor, assembled in the city of Ephesus, to Nestorius, the new Judas. Know that because of your ungodly doctrinal utterances and your disobedience to the canons, you were deposed by the holy synod on the 22nd of this month of June, and that you no longer hold any rank in the Church. "63

Church Father Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus and participant in this council, wrote about this, "Again the Egyptian races against God and fights with Moses and his servants, and the greater part of Israel agrees with the adversaries, for only too few are healthy who gladly endure even hardship for the sake of piety ... What comedy writer ever told such a fable, what tragedian ever poetized something so tearful?"64

Nestorios declared of this ecumenical gathering that Cyril was the whole meeting himself, "for whatever he said, everyone said after him. Undoubtedly he represented judgment through his person.... He called together those who pleased him from near and far, and made himself the judge ... Who was judge? Cyril. Who was the prosecutor? Cyril.

The Council of Ephesus 431 179

Who was bishop of Rome? Cyril. Cyril was everything". Pope Coelestine I, for his part, naturally vindicated himself "the greatest part, thanks to the help of the venerable Trinity," and boasted of having handed the knife to "cut this ulcer out of the body of the Church," as it "made the terrible rot appear felonious." (In the 20th century, the Catholic Church historian Palanque attests to the "heretic" Nestorios' bad character-and to St. Cyril's "malice. "65)

Pope Coelestine, however, transfigured the Ephesian assembly into a "great multitude of saints" that testified to him of "the presence of the Holy Spirit." Yet Cyril had only advanced the Roman, used him only for his fight against Constantinople, the patriarch as well as the emperor, the papal envoys had no influence whatsoever on the decisions, they had not even represented the entire West: the episcopate of Africa and Illyria was represented independently. Finally, even in the long report to Coelestine, the Roman legates, whose arrival was not even awaited, were only mentioned briefly and in passing at the last, which was quite in keeping with their appearance - despite some full-bodied phrases, such as "that the most holy and blessed Peter, first and chief of the apostles, pillar of the faith and foundation stone of the Catholic Church, received from our Lord Jesus Christ, the Redeemer of the human race, the keys of the kingdom and the power to bind and loose; he who lives and judges in his followers to this day and all time . . .", and so on.66

After all, however, not only had Cyril played Rome for himself, but also Coelestine, then really not much more than a trump card in the hands of the Alexandrian, had been distinguished in the East as hardly ever before. After all, the declaration of his legate, the priest Philip, was inserted into the minutes of the Council and still served the First Vatican Council (1870) as a proof of papal infallibility! To the papacy, at any rate, "the tragedy of the patriarch Nestorios in his struggle with Cyril and the Council of Ephesus offered the

i8o The struggle for the episcopal chairs of the East

opportunity to visibly demonstrate to all the world the new Roman pretensions of the Decretal Age on the great stage of the Oriental imperial Church. One can rightly speak of a tragedy,

because the different views of the Antiochian and Alexandrian schools on the question of the incarnation need not have become heretical and church-dividing. The driving moment to the catastrophe was formed by the lurking hatred and the relentless will to annihilation with which Cyril fomented the Nestorian controversy and drove it to the summit. His strongest fighting force was formed by clusters of monks - little educated, hostile to reason and therefore easily fanatized..." This is the judgment of the Catholic theologian and church historian Georg Schwaiger on one of the greatest saints

of Catholicism.⁶⁷

To be sure, the council was not over with Cyril's triumphant declaration of victory.

A few days later (because of bad weather and because "the horses fell") the Syrian bishops, then called "Orientals," who had been preemptively excluded by the saint, appeared under their patriarch John of Antioch, a friend of Nestorios. They immediately, hardly descended, constituted themselves on June 2.6 with a part of those who opposed Cyril on June 21, in the presence of the imperial commissioner and official protector of the council Candidian, as the undoubtedly "legitimate council, one cannot call it otherwise" (Seeberg), though as a much smaller synod of about 50 bishops. They deposed Cyril, as well as the heavily burdened local bishop Memnon, whose monastic orders so harassed Nestorios that he received military protection. (The sentence of deposition bears 42 signatures in the Greek acts, 53 in the Latin version of Rusticus). All the other council fathers, however, the synod declared excommunicated until they condemned Cyril's "heretical" propositions, "which openly contradict the teaching of the Gospel and the apostles." To the emperor the minority addressed a harsh protest against the "barbarous assembly" of the opponents and began the letters of Cyril

Council of Ephesus 431 181 Theodosius off, whereupon the saint let his hand-and-beat monkish mobs, among whom Shenute of Atripe (p. Z03 ff), saint of the Copts, particularly distinguished themselves, into the streets, and total anarchy reigned. It was barely possible to protect the Nestorian minority council from the incensed crowd, although Nestorios also accompanied a "truncheon guard" and threatened Cyril's bishops with their lives.⁶⁸

During the course of July, after the Roman envoys, bishops Arcadius and Projectus, and the priest Philip, the real spokesman, arrived on the 10th, the council majority met five more times. Already in his welcoming speech, Philip remarked that Pope Coelestine had already decided the matter by a letter to Cyril, whereupon a second papal letter was read first in Latin, the delegation insisted, then in Greek, and the assembled, obviously prepared by Cyril, cried out, "A right judgment! To the new Paul Cölestin! To the new Paul Cyril! Cölestin, the guardian of the faith, Cölestin, who is of one mind with the Synod! To Cölestin the whole Synod gives thanks! One Cölestin, one Cyril, one faith of the Synod, one faith of the whole world!" ("One people, one empire, one leader!" Which German of my generation, when hearing such totalitarian phrases, would not think of this - yet much more modest! - Cry of the Nazi era...?!)

A faith of the whole world! Yes, they still want - if it is their faith! Their unbelief ...

By the synodal acclamations, Alexandria and Rome were, so to speak, related to each other and equal, parity. The papal legate Philip therefore - in an evil sacral jargon - immediately put the matter in Roman perspective: "We thank the holy and venerable synod that after reading the letter of our holy and blessed pope before you, you have joined the holy members to the holy head by your holy voices and holy exclamations; for your blessedness knows very well that the head... of the whole faith and the apostles is the blessed apostle Peter." (So much holiness, after all, can only be lies!) And also the next day Philip brought

i8z The struggle for the episcopal chairs of the East.

Rome's ideas of primacy. But Bishop Theodore of Ancyra very cleverly undermined this intention.

Cyril himself did not think of being made a mandatary of the Pope either, and in the end again emphasized the primacy of the older synodal order, the consent of the Romans to the decision of the synod (not the other way around!), without, however, getting in each other's way, on both sides. Each needed and used the other for its own purposes.⁶⁹

On ii. July the papal delegation confirmed the deposition of Nestorios. On July 16, the majority council declared the deposition of Cyril and Memnon by the Orientals uncanonical and invalid. On July 17, it excommunicated Patriarch John of Antioch (after he had refused a triple summons) and ordered their

suspension from all ecclesiastical offices until "improvement occurs". Each council had thus quite Christianly cursed the other, each, by supreme command, sent a delegation to the court, and the emperor confirmed the decisions of both. An attempt at unification failed. For Cyril even the abbot Dalmatius, who was considered saintly, had become active, allegedly not leaving his cell for 48 years. Now, however, he placed himself at the head of clusters of monks and demonstrated under holy chants and accompanied by enormous crowds in front of the imperial palace, until the undecided ruler received him, who should now decide, had to, but wavered longer. At the beginning of August, the State Treasurer (comes sacrarum largitionum) John appeared in Ephesus with a letter from his master, which deposed Cyril, Memnon and Nestorios, until he himself, Comes John, when a dispute arose in his presence at a meeting of both parties, "to prevent unrest", also arrested all three main actors, Cyril, Nestorios and local bishop Memnon, the latter aparterwise in his own palace.

At this crucial stage of the Council, at which Cyril introduced the dogma of the "Mother of God" and "God-bearer," however, "for reasons that are partly shrouded in obscurity, a reversal in the mood of the The Council of Ephesus 431 183

Court was in the offing" (Library of the Church Fathers). For Cyril had soon escaped from imprisonment and by the end of October was back in Alexandria, where he rewarded his guards by being admitted to the clergy there, but above all, through his agents in the capital, he operated the continuation of the Council in his own way, as it were, à la Cyril. For now the man who by far most frequently, most pathetically speaks of the "charismatic in the church" (K. Rahner SJ), poured Pope Coelestine I. "my holy brother Cyril", "bonus fidei catholicae defensor", "probatissimus sacerdos", "vir apostolicus", whom Athanasius Sinaita praises "the seal of the Fathers" and whose name in general lives on in the history of the Church and dogma as that of the chosen instrument, the great administrator, yes, savior of Orthodoxy, now he lavishly poured the gold of the Alexandrian Church over the court. He was interspersed with his accomplices and informers, and the saint bribed God and the world, everything that could be bribed, but everything only "in favor of the threatened faith" (Grillmeier SJ). "Last theological negotiations ..." Dominican Camelot (with ecclesiastical permission to print) headlines this section - "... all things we do not want to go into in detail, because they do not directly touch the Council".⁷⁰

For that, we linger a bit here - especially since hardly anyone believes that the Alexandrian flooded the imperial court with his "Eulogies" for charitable reasons.

St. Cyril, by decree of the Congregation of Rites of 28. July 1882 with the highest title of the Catholic Church, "Doctor ecclesiae" - branded! -He donated, personally and through others, with commercial generosity and risking everything at the right moment, to the princesses, the court camarilla, coveted ostrich feathers, expensive fabrics, carpets, ivory furniture. He shifted huge sums of money to high state officials, his "well-known means of persuasion", as Nestorios mocked, who, of course, was yet to be mocked, his "golden arrows", money, a lot of money. Money for the wife of the praetorian prefect, money for influential eunuchs and chamber

184 The struggle for the bishop's chairs of the East

maids, who received up to 200 pounds of gold each, so that the Alexandrian see, though heavily rich, still had to borrow 1500 pounds of gold (100000 gold pieces), but still could not get by and went significantly into debt. (When Cyril's successor Dioskor took office, he found the coffers empty as a result of these bribes). In short, church teacher Cyril afforded himself, irrespective of his holiness, on the contrary, just proving this, "bribery maneuvers of the greatest style" (Caspar)-but at least such, writes Jesuit Grillmeier satisfied, "which did not miss their effect". The list is available, it can be read in the original council records, a letter from Epiphanius, Cyril's archdeacon and secretary (syncellus), to the new patriarch of Constantinople, Maximian, supposedly the oldest source, lists the "gifts," an enclosed

list records them precisely, and church father Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, reports on it as an eyewitness.⁷¹

An expensive dogma, no doubt. But after all, it is still valid today. And success justifies the means and here, quite literally, even the success mediators. After all, the Holy Spirit has often been inclined and theology, i.e., what it brings in, has cost quite a bit. Money plays a role in the enforcement of faith and violence relatively early – and then even more so. Jesuit Bacht casually touches upon "the rich bribes", with which "the patriarchs of Alexandria never [!] were frugal" – but others, Roman ones for instance, just as little! Church and "heretic" leaders operated with it, paid it, pocketed it, also Christian emperors, like already the

first one, Constantine, who not only showered the clergy with money and benefits (I 2x4 f, 235 ff), but also gave donations to the poor to make them Christians.⁷²

And certainly it played a role that the dogma of Mary's motherhood came about precisely in Ephesus – at the headquarters of the pagan mother deity, the Phrygian Cybele, the Ephesian city goddess Artemis, whose pilgrimage cult the Ephesians had known for centuries. Artemis, worshipped as "prayer-hearer," "savior," eternal virgin, beson–

The Council of Ephesus 431 185 of May, merged with Mary – while the last devotees of the goddess barracked her image in the temple "and carefully added all the pieces of the broken pillars and hinds that could still be found, while the building was torn down by the Christians in holy zeal" (Miltner).⁷³

Cyril, to whom the world owes – among other things – "the most famous Marian sermon of antiquity" (Hom. 4) (Altaner), if it is genuine, which even on the Catholic side meets strong doubts, had put his "golden arrows" in the middle of the black. Even the pious, episcopally sanctioned "Handbook of Church History" cannot help but speak of "an extensive gift campaign among the most influential personalities of the capital", by which the patriarch "imposed an enormous debt burden on the Alexandrian Church"; but at the same time seems piqued about it, because this "Nestorios later bitterly characterized as a bribe" – as if it had not been one of the most egregious. The Catholics, of course, as always in highly embarrassing cases, strain hardly less highly embarrassing excuses. Theologian Ehrhard, for example, of course does not subsume the huge bribes of the church teacher "under our today's term", because otherwise one would have to condemn him "most emphatically", and that must not be. So he glosses it over as a quite well-known contemporary "custom ... not to approach a [?] higher-ranking personality with a request without a gift". Even for Ehrhard, however, the saint would be "higher in our esteem if he had not submitted to this custom, but had relied solely on the goodness of his cause". But he could not do just that.

The Constantinople patriarch, however, was now visibly losing his footing. The mood at court changed. Emperor Theodosius II, dependent on his surroundings all his life, moreover intimidated by Cyril's terrorist monks as well as by that letter of Pope Coelestine, perhaps, which just then, in 431, inculcated Christ as the real Lord of his empire ("imperii rector"), which is why the regent had to reject Orthodoxy.

i86 The Struggle for the Bishop's See of the East

Emperor Theodosius dropped Nestorios, especially since the latter made the mistake of offering his abdication. He renounced his episcopate and only asked to work for the ruler to proclaim edicts in all churches about the rejection of "Cyrillic chatter", so as not to give offense to the simple-minded. On September 3, 431, Nestorios went to his old monastery near Antioch, and on October 25 was succeeded by the presbyter Maximian, a nullity that did not bother Cyril.

Ditto the pope. Coelestine welcomed Maximian's "elevation," dignified him with a letter entirely in the tone of the superior, and addressed a long pastoral letter to the clergy of Constantinople as if they were all under his command. And on March 15, 432, he once again fell upon the dethroned Nestorios. He

compared him to Judas, the latter coming off better. He castigated his "impiety," but was careful "not to give his perfidy the name <insanity>" because "not all impiety is insanity"; a very interpretive word. And while he chided Nestorios a "sinner" with "fogged look," he put himself in the most beautiful light. "To myself," wrote the Pope, "I vindicate the greatest part, thanks to the help of the venerable Trinity, in the restoration of the tranquility [!] of the whole Church and the summit of the present joy; because it was I ... I threw the seed ..." And, "since to cut this boil from the body of the Church made the terrible rottenness seem advisable, we handed with the knife at the same time the healing bandage."

Cyril, of course, also trumpeted his triumph to the world and did not rest until his damned adversary, the "ravening wolf", the "newly appeared dragon", "the treacherous man with poison-swollen tongue", who had nevertheless already resigned himself, keeping quiet for years, came into his own sphere of power. 436 first banished to Petra (South Palestine: Wadi Musa), he was finally transferred to a remote, almost waterless nest.

The Council of Ephesus 431 187 of the Egyptian desert (with the enchanting name "Oasis"), a place of residence for court officials and prisoners who had become disagreeable. Guarded by the scouts of the saint, in the most primitive conditions, but inwardly unbowed and still believing himself to be orthodox at the end of his life, Nestorios vegetated lonely and forgotten, abducted, resettled several times, until he died, after a futile plea for mercy, probably around 451 in the area of Panopolis (Upper Egypt). He left the world his memoirs, the "Book of Heraclides," his sorrowful autobiography (edited in 1910), in which he draws parallels to the fate of his predecessor John Chrysostom, also to Athanasius, and to Flavian.⁷⁴

Nestorios had succumbed to the interplay of Alexandria, Rome, and finally the court. Pope Coelestine I had implored Theodosius to provide succor to make his own rule the more permanent. And after the council, he celebrated the monarch almost effusively, calling his empire with the prophet an "empire for all eternity". This title of glory would remain with him, "no time and no aging will extinguish it. For eternal is what is done for the love of the eternal king." This was indeed completely in accordance with his earlier words: "Blessed is the emperorship that is devoted to the service of God's cause". In truth, however, it is not the emperorship that is blessed, but the papacy. And so it should be. That is what it is all about! Which is why every harshness, meanness, baseness is self-evident. Walter Ullmann rightly emphasizes that it was the pope who asked the emperor to exclude Nestorios, who had already been condemned by the bishop's sentence, from the society – for Johannes Haller a sign "how much the fallen man was still feared and hated", who had even been expected to reopen the Pelagian controversy.⁷⁵ Council chronicler Camelot, however, presents us with a typically Catholic theological résumé. Starting with the question of which was the "real Council of Ephesus," he begins by saying that many modern historians see in this

i88 The Struggle for the Episcopal Chairs of the East

synod "only a rather sad affair", a "lamentable and intricate tragedy", staged by the Alexandrian "Pharaoh" (quotation, by the way, from a famous Catholic, admittedly not entirely unplucked, the church historian Louis Duchesne), and expresses, in fact, "even today, very many scholars, even good ones, who are by no means all heretics, feel driven to judge severely, even <to discredit> Cyril's conduct in this whole affair, and thereby the Council itself." It is not uncommon to think that Camelot himself is inclined to do this, since he gives weighty reasons for the council of Nestorios and John and weighty ones against that of Cyril, whose contestability and objectionability are "absolutely beyond doubt." Then, of course, he writes: "The presence of the Roman legates, however, is sufficient to ensure the ecumenical character of Cyril's council, which the synod of the Oriental bishops lacked. Thus Cyril's Council, and not John's, was in communion with the Pope".

This proves once again, as a thousand times in history, that one only has to make common cause with

the pope and injustice becomes right. Nevertheless, Camelot says that some speak of the "Robber Synod of Ephesus", which is not worth more than that of 449 (p. 220 ff). Yes, Horst Dallmayr in his book "Die großen vier Konzilien", published by the Catholic Kösel-Verlag, calls this assembly, at which the papal legates nevertheless found "everything canonical and according to the church rule", "a fiasco", the "most annoying council in church history".⁷⁶

Today there are only a few Christian monuments left in Ephesus, the former council church is in ruins, and in Izmir, far and away the largest city, there are about 2,000 Christians living among a population of about 450,000.⁷⁷

The "Union" 189 The "Union", an almost UNBELIEVABLE TRADE OF FAITH, AND Cyril's trickery with the monk Victor.

But when the wind changed again, when storms of protest began throughout the East, Cyril, whose gold and cunning had by now triumphed, relinquished for the sake of his position almost everything he had theologically represented at Ephesus. The two synods – Pope Coelestine had congratulated several times on the successful work of the council in March 432 – had in fact divorced completely unreconciled. But after some back and forth, Cyril capitulated dogmatically as early as 433. He abandoned considerable portions of his terminology and signed a creed as a formula of union that even Nestorios would have largely, if not wholly, accepted. Now, in fact, he allowed the distinction between the human and divine attributes of Christ, which he had previously rejected, to stand and professed a typically ambiguous compromise formula: Christ true God and true man in "unmixed unity"; and, accordingly, Mary Mother of God. "In the end, Nestorius could also have signed this" (Haller). Yes, today, even for Horst Dallmayr, who professes to be a Christian, "there are not many people who doubt that Nestorius would have signed this union symbol with all his heart. He just didn't get around to it, because it wasn't presented to him." It was the wording of a letter of protest against Cyril's "Anathematis-men," a symbolum probably penned by

Theodoret of Cyrus, which the Antiochians allied with Nestorios had already drawn up in Ephesus in 431, word for word, and sent to the court! "Let the heavens rejoice, let the earth be glad," Cyril now shouted to John. And in return for his signature, the Antiochians now recognized, though Cyril continued to insist on this, because only this was decisive for him, the consecration of the new Patriarch of Constantinople, Maximian, and – compared by Seeberg to a "moral suicide" – the condemnation of his predecessor Nestorios.

190 The struggle for the episcopal chairs of the East

Yet they taught the same as he! On their way back from Ephesus, in Tarsus, in Antioch itself, they had condemned their main opponent, Cyril, as an apol-linarist in two synods out of great indignation, an insult that was always repeated in their pamphlets, and they had expelled the holy church teacher and his followers from the church. Bishop Alexander of Hierapolis still demanded his retraction of the Anathematisms. Yes, an opposition group, led by Bishops Helladius of Tarsus and Euthérius of Tyana, urged the new Pope Sixtus III to condemn the Alexandrian. Whole provinces fell away from John. Emperor Theodosius, however, had no use for the clerical dispute. He called in Symeon the Stylite, the saint much derided in ancient and modern times (by Gibbon, Tennyson, Haller), but highly praised by the church, who stood first seven years on a small, then thirty years on a large column, allegedly snatched whole tribes of peoples from "idolatry" and generally worked such a quantity of extraordinary miracles that it borders "on the unbelievable" even for Catholics (Wetzer/Weite) ■. However, Symeon, who was so rich in miracles and faces and who was once persecuted even by his own monks in the monastery of Teleda, was obviously powerless against the clergy. And even when a special envoy of Theodosius, the tribune and notary Aristolaos sent to Antioch, demanded the condemnation of Nestorios together with his writings, the Orientals continued to resist at a synod. Only after Patriarch

John invoked the "secular arm" and the emperor's officials cracked down, did the Syrian episcopate sign the condemnation of Nestorios, except for a weak minority gathered around the Nestorian Metropolitan Alexander of Hierapolis, who was dethroned and exiled to Egypt at the instigation of the patriarch. Once again, corruption and violence triumphed. But John, who deposed Cyril with all his prelates at Ephesus in 431, now wrote: "We agreed (with the Orthodox bishops at Ephesus) in deposing Nestorius . .!"⁷⁸

The "Union" 191

It was an almost unbelievable bargain called the "Union" between Patriarchs Cyril and John, with two popes having a hand in it: Coelestine I, by now dead, and his successor Sixtus III, who wrote to John with complacency bordering on cynicism, "By the outcome of this matter you have learned what it means to be of one mind with us" (and, in memory of the Council, decorated the Basilica of Santa Maria Maggiore, which he had rebuilt, with mosaics of Mary).

Several bishops outside Cyril's sphere of influence attacked him fiercely, such as Succensus of Diocaesarea or Valerian of Tarsus. But even some of his own followers, among them one of his first, Acacius of Melitene, a fierce antipode of Nestorios, were scandalized in such a way that Cyril had to take reproaches, to give explanations, in short, to maneuver badly and unscrupulously in order not to lose them; while John, who was nevertheless bound to Nestorios by an old friendship, appeared as his traitor. More and more the Antiochians stood as defendants, while Cyril and Alexandria, as the stronger power, triumphed. Shortly after, Theodosius II and Valentinian III had all the writings of Nestorios burned. "Behold, beloved brother," Pope Sixtus praised to the Antiochian patriarch the "most gracious and most Christian emperors," "how vigilantly they have devoted themselves to the cause of religion; no rest in deliberation have they known, nor cared for worldly things, if they had not done the heavenly (before) enough.... They have espoused the cause of Him who has never denied Himself to their empire. They know that they lend their care to Him who repays it with rich interest. Praise is due us for this, as we see earthly rulers allied to the heavenly King."

Throne and altar! "Give me, O Emperor, the earth cleansed of heretics, and I will give Thee heaven in return. Destroy with me the heretics, and I will destroy with thee the Persians!" Thus Nestorios had cried out in his inaugural sermon

The fight for the bishop's chairs of the East

19z-----

(S. 157). Now he himself was a "heretic" and destroyed. With the exception of the "Liber Hera-clidis" (available in Syriac transmission), almost only fragments of him are preserved, although he himself was not a "Nestorian" and was not at all far from the formula soon proclaimed as orthodox at Chalcedon (p. 229 ff). Until the end he declared himself "orthodox" - already contemporaries spoke of a "Nestorian tragedy". And indeed he could not be proved as a "heretic" until today. Well-known researchers tried to rehabilitate him. Dogma historian Reinhold Seeberg has explained Nestorios' faith according to the "Liber Hera-clidis", which sharply criticizes Cyril and shows his own position, and summarizes:

""Heretical" is indeed nothing in this teaching ... In its result it is in complete agreement with Leo and the Chalcedonense. The difference is only that the latter have left it enough in general accusations and assertions, while Nestorios has as carefully refuted the opponents as developed his view. It is hardly saying too much to call his book the most significant and perceptive attempt to solve the Christological problem that the ancient Church produced." To what extent he really taught "heretically," writes Catholic Franzen, "remains unclear to this day." Mainly because on this side one rarely admits a grave error, a crime.

The Nestorians, however, now publicly persecuted, fled in droves to the Persian Empire. There, where they were well received, they further weakened the already weak Catholica. In 485, the heads of both

churches, the Nestorian Barsumas of Ni-sibis and Catholic Babuaeus of Seleucia, hurled the ban against each other. Babuaeus was executed the same year. The Nestorians, however, officially separated from the Catholics since the Synod of Seleucia in 486, spread powerfully. Since they sharply contested the Monophysites as well, this led to new struggles. Nevertheless, they expanded, reaching Ceylon around the 6th century and the Turks of Central Asia, in the 7th century, along the Silk Road, China, where Christian-

Union" 193 tum tolerated for almost two centuries. Many, writes the Catholicos Timothy I (780-82.3), zealous for mission, "crossed the seas to India and China, taking with them only staff and bag." In the 14th century, however, the Mongol storm caused an abrupt and sharp decline. In the 16th century, many Nestorians joined Rome as Uniate so-called Chaldeans and Malabarchrists. In the 17th century, many Nestorians became Monophysites (Jacobites). But still in the 20th century there is a (small) Nestorian Church in Iraq, Iran, Syria, there are over 100000 Nestorians in Kurdistan, about 5000 Nestorians in India and 25 000 Nestorians in the USA. Meanwhile, Nestorios remained the goddamned "heretic", while already the Council of Chalcedon, however telling enough, celebrated Cyril as the second Athanasius and adorned him with the title of a "trustee of the orthodox and immaculate faith".⁷¹ In fact, the saint was completely devious, like, no doubt, very many princes of the Church, who, meanwhile, do not all become saints, let alone Doctors of the Church. But however cunningly the "administrator" fought before the elimination of his opponent - supposedly for the faith, not for the power -, now that he had the power, the faith seemed no longer, so important. If only recently he threatened Nestorios with the Lord: "Do not think that I came to bring peace to the world; it was not peace that I wanted to bring, but the sword", after the destruction of Nestorios in the spring of 433 he opened John of Antioch, he was "mindful of the word of the Lord: <My peace I give you, my peace I leave you>". He was also taught to pray, "Lord our God, give peace, for with it you have given us everything." Yes, after he had everything!⁸⁰

What was before no longer counted. John also thought so, writing to him, "As for the reasons of these disagreements, we need not go into them in these times of peace." Quite similarly, Cyril replicated, "In what way the schism had occurred need not be explained. Rather, I think it is more appropriate to i?4 The struggle for the episcopal chairs of the East

think and say what is fitting for the time of peace." And there he could now quickly "fully convince himself ...

that the division of the churches is quite irrelevant and therefore no longer appropriate." In terms of faith, too, everything was now right. Having been graced by the "beloved brother and officemate John" with "an unimpeachable confession of faith," he can only "state, after these "holy words," that we think as you do. For it is just <one Lord, one faith, one baptism> (Eph. 4:5)." Yes, now everything seems to be in butter. Cyril, the great champion of the faith, the administrator of Orthodoxy, now no longer insisted on Alexandrian school expressions, but adopted the formula of faith of a moderate Antiochian Christology. He suddenly professed "a high degree of conciliation" (Catholic Ehrhard). And the grumblers, the blamers, the "unintelligent", the "false teachers", the people full of "folly" and "fairy tales", all those "who are accustomed to pervert what is right", to "pervert" the Holy Spirit, all those who "go about in the manner of wild wasps

and speak evil words against me in their mouths", yes, they must be "given up to laughter", they must be "muzzled". They load "on their heads an unquenchable fire." ⁸¹

The Union trade makes evident how little Cyril, a teacher of the Church, cared for the faith. After all, he was apparently hardly interested in the Pelagian controversy, which did not concern his lust for power, while Pope Coelestine - who was not even able to assert himself against the Catholic bishops of Africa in the Apiarius affair (p. 84 ff) - persecuted the Pelagians in Gaul, Britain, to the end of the world

of that time, to Ireland, before he himself passed away "blessed in the Lord" (Gröne).⁸²

And to the "Union" trade corresponds the – if you will – smaller rogue play with the monk Viktor. Victor, presumably an abbot, was one of Cyril's accusers from the "filthy heap of Alexandria," whose complaints had been the occasion of the council, one of the most dangerous, who enjoyed special respect. His accusation was defeated in Ephesus. Now, after Cyril's victory, Victor feared for his existence.

St. Cyril as a "heretic"-persecutor ¹⁹⁵ On the other hand, however, Cyril also still had to fear the reputation and knowledge of the monk who so impressed even the emperor. Thus, Victor now found himself ready to declare that he had never accused Cyril. He corroborated this incredible lie by an oath, whereupon he could return to his Alexandrian monastery. And Cyril, St. Doctor of the Church, not only pretended to believe the oath, but played the sworn lie "as the strongest trump card" in his own defense against the emperor. Like himself, he said, Viktor had been slandered. He had never accused him, his patriarch. Thus, in the end, both stood unblemished.⁸³

The Alexandrian had won a tremendous triumph through the Council of Ephesus, not so much theologically as, the real meaning of the matter, ecclesiastically. "The council," Heinrich Kraft points out, "had its importance in that it finally led clearly to the condemnation of Nestorius; on the other hand, it contributed little to the clarification of Christological dogma." It was above all a victory over the patriarch of Constantinople, the capital, but also over the government, which at least initially stood by Nestorius. The Patriarchate of Alexandria, in the ascendancy since Athanasius, now reached the height of its power. Cyril became the leader of the Eastern Church, indeed, he "raised his temporal authority in Egypt above that of the local imperial representatives" (Ostrogorsky).⁸⁴

St. Cyril as a "heretic" persecutor and initiator of the first "final solution".

The whole horrendous imperiousness of this saint, however, is satisfied –typically, of course, for Catholicism in general– under the pretext of the struggle for faith; whereby, after all, Cyril's Opera, despite various losses, fills ten volumes of the Patrologia Graeca, a volume surpassed among all the ancient Church Fathers only by Augustine and John Chrysostom.

i<?6 The Struggle for the Bishop's Chairs of the East

Incessantly, Cyril sees the "Church of God" threatened by so "many heresies," by the "wicked and godless doctrines" of other Christians, "godless ones" who "but also very quickly plunge into the depths of the underworld," into "the snare of death," if they do not – he helped – "come to an ignominious end already in this life." Only against the background of his obsession with power does the often so tiring, numbingly formless flood of his invective become understandable. He continues the demonization of all Christians of other faiths already in the first centuries (I ch. 3) rather more massively, thereby walking completely in the footsteps of his notorious predecessor and teacher, St. Athanasius, "our blessed and highly famous father", whom he does not surpass in stubbornness, but in brutality and at least reaches in stylistic inability. Even on the Catholic side, one does not find "much that is attractive" in Cyril's language and presentation, which cannot be a coincidence. One calls his expression "dull and prolix and yet again turgid and overloaded" (Bibliothek der Kirchenväter), in short, his writings "do not occupy a very high literary rank" (Altaner/Stuiber) – to put it mildly.

Whoever does not like him can actually only be a "heretic". He accuses them of "lack of understanding", "excessive", "immoderate ignorance", "perversity and depravity" – because whoever teaches otherwise is always morally bad – of "annoyance", "blasphemies", "madness", "jugglery and empty talk", "folly taken to extremes". Such people are "sacrilegious in the highest degree," "justly perverters and slanderers," "as it were drunk," "befuddled by intoxication," corroded by the "yeast of wickedness," "very diseased with ignorance of God," full of "madness" and doctrines of "devilish origin." "Indeed, they falsify the faith handed down to us, based on the invention of the new-appearing

dragon," that is, here, of Nestorios.⁸⁵

Cyril often hardly finds an end with such vituperative canons, as they are entitled to a saint, however.

And of course he demands – now to the address of the emperor: "So away with

St. Cyril as "heretic" persecutor 197

the crushing effusion of those people ..." "Away, then, with all babble and empty talk, with all delusion and deceit of dressed-up words!" As Nestorios already in his inaugural sermon called out to the emperor: "Destroy with me the heretics –" and still in May 428 obtained an edict against all "heresies", so also for Cyril the "heretic" extermination was a natural duty of the ruler. For, he threatened with the Old Testament, "if they do not convert, the Lord will make his sword sparkle against them." The Lord was not only the emperor, the Lord was above all Cyril.

Thus, immediately after his election as bishop on October 17, 412, he took sharp action against the hitherto tolerated and thoroughly "orthodox" Novatians. They could not impress Cyril as particularly strict in morals. In an open fight against the imperial governor, he had their churches forcibly closed, expelled them himself and, another violation of state law, had their property disappear into his pocket, just like the private property of the Novatian bishop Theopemptos. Cyril, boasts the "Library of the Church Fathers", gives many a sect "the death blow", admittedly with the "pen", his "main weapon", one thinks here. "O of madness!" he cries again and again. "O of the foolishness and the mad sense". "O of the old woman's mind and the slackened spirit that can only babble ..." Yes, "heretics" have merely "godless inventions," "vile fables," "purest nonsense." And they always stand on the "summit of wickedness". "Verily, an opened grave is their throat ..., adder poison is under their lips". "Sober up, you drunkards, from your intoxication!"⁸⁶

Cyril also persecuted the Messalians (from Syr. mšallyāne = praying ones, therefore called Euchites in Greek): Ascetics apparently mostly of the lower classes, with long hair and penitential garb, who abstained from work and sought to serve Christ in renunciation, in complete poverty. At the same time, they cultivated the cohabitation of men and women as an expression of "brotherhood," which particularly displeased the Catholics. Having condemned them earlier, Cyril in

198 The C impf for the Bishop's Chairs of Eastern Ephesus once again condemn their teachings, their practices, and thus drive them himself underground. Of course, many others joined in the hunt.

Patriarch Atticus of Constantinople (406–425), whom Pope Leo I praises, the Greek Church venerates as a saint (feast: January 8 and n. October), urges the bishops of Pamphylia to expel the Messalians like vermin and mice. Patriarch Flavian of Antioch has them expelled from Edessa and all Syria. Bishop Amphilo-chios of Iconium persecutes them in his diocese, as does Bishop Letoios of Melitene, who sets fire to their monasteries; for church father Bishop Theodoret: "dens of robbers". Nevertheless, the Messalians were still reviving in the Bogumils in the Middle Ages.⁸⁷

But whenever Cyril attacks – this too is typical of clergy politics through two millennia – there is always an abyss of error, foolishness, nonsense, delusion on one side. And on the other side the immaculate orthodoxy, he himself, whose "wise and understanding exposition is not subject to censure in any point", as he modestly certifies himself. Always he and his belong to those who have firmly founded their faith "on the unshakable rock, preserve piety to the end ... and laugh at the impotence of their opponents. "With us is God ...>". Always there shines the "splendor of truth", and there everything bristles with "ignorance and insanity", one preaches "as it were in sleep and in intoxication", one knows "neither the scriptures nor the power of God!". Therefore, as is right, sleep off your intoxication – ⁸⁸ "The most beautiful testimony of his noble sense is", Cyril praises a "special edition" very highly issued under Hitler with ecclesiastical printing permission, "that he sought to preserve the commandment of brotherly love even in battle and, despite his innate vehemence, did not allow himself to be tempted to a breach of self-control even by the basest spitefulness of his opponent". Even to a more recent researcher,

this saint appears to be "an intellectual of the distinctly cerebral type" and his fight against "heresy" is still "so backward".

St. Cyril as a "heretic" persecutor" (Jouassard) – at least next to his attacks on pagans or even Jews!⁸ Patriarch Cyril, who misses in the latter "any understanding of the mystery" of Christianity, speaks of their "lack of understanding", their "disease", calls them spiritually "blind", "crucifixes", "lord murderers", treats them in his writings "even worse.... than paganism" (Jouassard). But not only literarily, like most of the old

church fathers (I ch. 2), also really he struck. Already in 414, the man "of extraordinary energy", this "character of one cast" (Catholic Daniel-Rops), seized all the synagogues of Egypt and turned them into Christian churches. Also in Palestine at that time the Jews were suppressed more and more, the synagogues were burned down by fanatical monks. And when Cyril in Alexandria itself, where many Jews lived, ordered their leaders to come to him and threatened them, there are said to have been atrocities on the Jewish side, a nocturnal massacre, which, according to sources, can neither be proven nor denied in principle. In any case, the saint now, without any authority, under his leadership, had the synagogue stormed, destroyed by a huge mob of people, looted the property of the Jews as in war, and expelled them himself with wife and child, without belongings, without food, allegedly more than 100,000, perhaps 200,000 people. The expulsion was total, the Alexandrian Jewish community, which had existed for 700 years, the largest in the Diaspora, exterminated – the first "final. solution" in church history. "It may be that this action of Cyril", says the "Library of the Church Fathers", 1935, "cannot be entirely absolved of ruthlessness and violence".

When Orestes, the imperial governor, immediately complained in Constantinople, a horde of desert monks of the saint rushed up, "smelling from afar the odor of blood and bigotry" (Bury), insulted Orestes, who had been baptized in Constantinople, as idolaters, pagans, and proceeded feloniously against him. They wounded him in the head by throwing a stone and would probably have killed him had not the people

200 The Struggle for the Bishop's Chair of the East

interceded on his behalf. To the assassin Ammonios, dying on torture, Cyril paid the honors of a martyr, which not even all Christians considered him to be. Yes, he glorified the monk in a sermon – and had his force of thugs, which an imperial decree of October 5, 416 reduced to 500, increased to 600 already on February 3, 418.¹⁰

After the torture death of the "martyr" however one was accordingly stimulated for the murder of Hypatia.

For in the course of the Alexandrian tumults, in March 415, with Cyril's consent and "stirred up" by him (Lacarriere), the pagan philosopher Hypatia, known and celebrated throughout the world at that time, was slaughtered: a daughter of the mathematician and philosopher Theon, the last head of the Alexandrian Museion University known to us; a teacher of the church father Bishop Synesius of Cyrene, who apostrophized her by letter as "mother, sister and teacher," a "God-loving philosopher" who herself had Christian listeners. As then, to the resentment of Cyril, also the Praefectus augustalis Orestes liked to associate with her. However, after the patriarch had whipped up the people, defamed Hypatia as a sorceress in his sermons, and spread bogus reports about her, the monks of the saint, led by the cleric Peter, attacked her from behind, dragged her into the church of Kaisarion, stripped her naked, literally tore her apart with broken glass, and publicly burned the dismembered corpse – "the first witch hunt in history" (Thieß).⁹¹

But also, indeed, even more, a persecution of pagans. And Patriarch Cyril was "generally regarded as the spiritual author of the crime" (Güldenpenning). Even the anthology "Reformers of the Church", published with imprimatur in 1970, writes of one of the greatest Catholic saints: "He is at least [!]

morally jointly responsible for the vile murder of the noble pagan Hypathia". The Christian historian Socrates, on top of that one who among his colleagues strives for the most "objectivity", reports that the crime was committed by the people of St. Cyril and St. Peter.

St. Cyril as a persecutor of "heretics

of the Church of Alexandria. "Thus, one can be convinced that the noble and highly educated woman actually became the most prominent victim of the fanatical bishop" (Tinnefeid). Paganism possessed even stronger positions in Egypt than is usually believed. There were larger pagan groups among the so-called people, and there were significant anti-Christian figures in the leadership strata, especially among intellectuals.⁹²

In the pagans, however, Cyril, who continued the struggle of his predecessor and uncle Theophil against them, could naturally see nothing different in principle from Jews. They had to be "beaten to the ground," as did Josias, whom he praised,) "who burned the idolaters with their groves and altars, exterminated all kinds of sorcery and divination, and suppressed the wiles of diabolical deceit." Cyril does not fail to add: "In this way he secured for his government recognition and praise among the ancients; and to this day he is admired by all who appreciate the fear of God." ⁹³

But this holy criminal, a man who on the one hand claims that the Greek philosophers stole their best from Moses, on the other hand himself copied parts of his own *Sudates* from others, as boringly mostly as spread (thirty books alone "Against the godless Julian": ten each against one book each of Julian's "Against the Galileans"!): Cyril, convicted of many lies, of slandering Nestorios, of the highest bribery, guilty of expropriation in favor of the church and in his favor, of banishment, of many thousands of expulsions of the most brutal kind, of aiding and abetting murder, this devil, who proved again and again what a "dangerous risk" it is, he says himself, "to be at enmity with God and to offend him in some way by deviating from the path of duty", was soon praised "defender of truth", "fiery lover of accuracy". The initiator of the first "final solution" of Christian church history, which was admittedly to be followed by many more "final solutions", became "the most distinguished saint of the Byzantine

202 The Struggle for the Bishop's Chairs of the East

Orthodoxy" (v. Campenhausen), but also one of the most radiant saints of the Roman Catholic Church, "doctor eccle-siae", Doctor of the Church. Even after Hitler's extermination of the Jews he is for Catholics "in the whole meaning of the word an exceedingly virtuous man" (Pinay)! Thereby already in the 16th century the Catholic L. S. Le Nain de Tillemont sneered discreetly and with the cynicism so often celebrated on this page: "Cyril is holy, but one cannot say that all his actions are equally holy". As then also Cardinal Newman, apparently irritated, comically confronted the "external deeds" of Cyril with "his inner holiness."*

A researcher like Geffcken, of course, despite his striving for impartiality, despite his effort to seek "the good in both camps", is "again and again violently" repelled by Cyril. After all, he finds there: "fanaticism without real, let alone luminous passion, erudition without depth, diligence without real fidelity in small things, clumsy scrappiness without dialectical exercise and, at the very last, no honesty in battle ..." This is not only Geffcken's opinion, but probably that of almost all non-Catholic historians. And this has its good or rather evil reasons.⁵

When the great saint died, all Egypt breathed a sigh of relief. A letter, perhaps apocryphal, but attributed to Church Father Theodoret, professes the general relief: 'At last, at last, this terrible man has died. His departure rejoices the survivors, but it will grieve the dead.'"⁶

What creatures acted in the patriarch's environment will be shown in more detail by at least one example.

SCHENUTE OF ATRIBE IOJ SCHENUTE OF ATRIBE (CA. 348¹⁶⁶!) as the head of the monastery.

Schenute (sai'disch = son of God) was companion of Cyril at the Council of Ephesus, where he "played an outstanding role" (Lexicon for Theology and Church). Before that, however, as a boy he tended cattle in Upper Egypt - often the beginning of a great Christian career. He came early to the White Monastery of his uncle Pgöl, was there often severely punished and had allegedly soon fasted so scrawny that, according to his disciple Visa, "the skin stuck to his bones." But since 383 he himself directed the White Monastery near Atriipe in the Thebais, a double monastery, where he at times directed up to 2200 monks and 1800 nuns. Even Johannes Leipoldt, Schenute's modern biographer, who is so fond of protecting his hero and emphasizes that he was "more than a hard tyrant", sees him tirelessly harassing "pagans and sinners" with "reckless violence", a man "whose fist is as nimble as his tongue.... a strong hero". The "great abbot," "prophet," and "apostle" did not shy away from physical fraud or murder with his own hands. Rather he could beat his monks even for smallest "offenses", a laugh already, a smile, barbarously for decades, occasionally also one slain. Visa's "Life of the Schenute" regularly paraphrases this with the impressive sentence: "... the earth opened up, and the sacrilegious sank alive into hell".⁹⁷ Maltreatment is particularly popular with theocratic groups. After all, they are not only beaten for the sake of "improvement" or to strengthen their own "authority", but they are also magically purified, as it were, and harmful miasma is eliminated. Already in the Jewish sacral law there was the physical chastisement; however, it should not be more than, after all, 40 blows, then 39. (For the Egyptian right 100 blows are attested, for the Greek 50 and 100). In Christian times the whipping is maintained, yes, frequently practiced; whereby one considers however - significant - with the punishment the state of the persons! Even as Kir-

104 The Struggle for the Bishop's Chair in the East

The flagellation was also known as a penance for the church. Thus the 16th Synod of Toledo (693) decreed that in the case of idolatry or fornication, persons of lower rank were to be punished with 100 lashes each. However, not only the (lower) laity, but

even the own clergy was beaten, at the latest from the 5th to the 19th century! However, one struck particularly steadily, intimately in the monasteries. Even Jean Paul writes that "the Catholic novice is beaten into a monk." ⁸

Schenute, vacillating between exaltation and deep depression, had regulated every little thing in writing, and every little thing he treated as a state action. But it was not important to him "that the commandments important for the monastery be kept, but that his sovereign will remain in force."

True, at times he recognizes the barbarity of his regiment, he confesses that God does not advise him "to wage this great war within you," he vows to rule more mildly, to leave sinners to the judgment of heaven. But such stirrings are brief. He acts harshly, more ruthlessly perhaps, Leipoldt suspects, than the monastic rule dictated. Every offense had to be confessed. Showing off was favored, urgently demanded. And he beat the brothers with his own hands, who often rolled on the floor in pain. When one of them succumbed to his ordeals, he talked himself out of it sophistically, no: Christianly. He was, after all, a "character well aware of his position" (Benedictine Engber-ding) - and became a saint of the Coptic Church (feast: 7th Abib = July 1).¹⁰⁰

Schenute's crudeness also shows his behavior against those who cut off their genitals "to become pure". Sexual intercourse or even a mere "felonious" offense is said to have usually prevented the strictness of the enclosure. The monks were forbidden to talk to each other in the dark, the nuns were forbidden to see even a physical brother on his deathbed! Also a healer ascetic was not allowed to treat a woman nor a male member. All the more luxuriantly, however, the horniest fantasies proliferated. And these "misdemeanors" return in the sin-

SCHENUTE VON ATRIPE 105 nissen of the white monastery constantly again. If scrupulous ones, "in order to become pure", cut off their penis, which the church, with all its crazy chastity mania,

forbade, the saint threw them without further ado in front of the gate. "Lay them, as they bathe themselves in the blood of their wound, on a bed and bring them to the roadway And they may be a (deterrent) example or sign to all who pass by." Of course, he is not completely merciless. At least he allows – only permission, however, by no means commandment – not to let self-mutilators die immediately at the White Monastery for the sake of the salvation of the soul. For "if you want it for God's sake, hand them over to their relatives, so that they do not die in our surroundings . .".¹⁰¹ Only the abbot did not spank the nuns himself; he probably shied away from temptations. A kind of permanent envoy, an "old man", represented him there. And the "mother" of the convent, the headmistress, had to report all cases of punishment to him, the "father," whereupon he determined the number of beatings. Only girls could be beaten at any time without his consent. In both monasteries, as in others, there were children, although not much more is known about their existence, except that in them corporal punishment "played a major role"; "children always had the privilege of being beaten a lot in the White Monastery". Their misery in Christian monasteries deserved thorough studies. Also their fate in (Christian) homes even today!¹⁰²

A letter unique in the writing of Coptic monasticism reports on the beatings that Abbot Schenute inflicted on the nuns:

"Theonoe, the daughter of Apa Hermef, of whom you told us in the first time that she committed crimes in a wicked way and that she stole: thirty strokes of the cane.

The sister of Apa Psyros, of whom you told us in the first time that she was secretly carrying something away: twenty strokes of the cane.

Sophia, the sister of the little old man, of whom you have reported to us that she obstinately contradicted and countered those who taught her, and many (others) without reason, and that she

206 The struggle for the bishop's chairs of the East

slapped the old woman on the face or head: twenty strokes of the cane.

Jenbiktör, the sister of little John, of whom you told us that her insight and knowledge were not complete: fifteen strokes of the cane.

Taese, the sister of little Pshai, of whom you told us that she hastened to Sansnö in friendship and carnal desire: fifteen strokes of the cane.

Taküs, whose name is Hrebekka, whose mouth has learned to speak in lies and vanity: twenty-five strokes of the cane.

Sophia, the sister of Zechariah: ten strokes of the cane. And I know why they will be given to her.

And her sister Apolle also deserved to be given strokes of the cane. But because of God and because of the care that is given to her, we forgive her this time, both for that (forbidden) intercourse and for the garment that she put on in vain lust.... For I know that she would not be able to bear it (caning), since she is very fat and plump....

Sophia, the sister of Joseph: fifteen strokes of the cane. And I know why they will be given to her.

Sansnö, the sister of Apa Hello, which says: I teach others: forty strokes of the cane. For sometimes she hastened to her neighbor full of friendship; sometimes again she lied because of vain, transitory things, so that she harms her soul, of which the whole world is not worth, still less a picture or a drinking bowl or a cup, because of which she lies.

All these (blows) the old man will give them with his hands (i.e. personally) on their feet while they are sitting on the ground and the old woman and Taböm hold them to him and other older women with them. And also those old men..., holding their feet with sticks until he ceases to chastise them, as we also did to some in the beginning. But those who oppose him in anything, let him name them to us when he comes to us; we will then teach you what is to be done with them. But if he wants to give them more blows, fine;

St. Shenute as a fighter of pagans 207

it is right what he will do. But if he wants to give less, that is for him to determine. If he wants to expel someone, good. But if his heart is pleased with some of you, so that he will forgive them this time also.... good. "103

Even the punishment of expulsion, which was frequent, was sometimes preceded by imprisonment and scourging. But theologian Leipoldt justifies these and other monstrosities more or less summarily: "The success is there: Shenute saved his monastery as well as he could through the dangers of the too rapid growth. The following period was accustomed to the Rule and its hardships...."10*

St. Shenute as a fighter of pagans – robbing, ruining and murdering

Now Shenute's activity was not exhausted in beating, how intensively and extensively he did it.

Rather, his terror is closely connected with the downfall of paganism in Egypt. And this happened there – where already Clemens Alexandrinus found the people "worse than the apes" because of their service to the gods (cf. 1196 ff) – since the late 4th century even more violently than elsewhere.¹⁰⁵

The extermination campaigns, however, almost always took place under the leadership of bishops and abbots, who saw even in the most glorious temples only foci of infection, strongholds of Satan. And the most evil destroyers were those "swinish blackcoats," as the Greeks said, who looked like men but lived like pigs. As ascetics, whose repressed instincts tended especially to aggression, destructiveness, they were as it were made for the business of ruining, especially as their ranks were filled with all kinds of eccentrics, of tragicomic existences. Even the origins of some of their most famous are almost typical. Shenute was a cattle herder, Macarius a smuggler, Moses a highwayman, Antony a school failure.

208 The struggle for the bishop's chairs of the East

Their disciples and comrades-in-arms had chosen the "anti-culture" and had gained prestige in the Christian world not least by "facing the devil downright like <professional boxers>" (Brown).¹⁰⁶

In agitated hordes, gladly dressed in animal skins, they roamed the land, ravaging temples, burning, grinding even the most grandiose works of art, they seemed to represent only gods. Since the state officials were more casual in the persecution of paganism, they took the monks in hand. They were almost never missing where an old sanctuary was burned, a "heretic" church, a synagogue was burned, or where money was to be taken. And crowds of looters plundered villages suspected of unbelief. "The monks commit many crimes", even Emperor Theodosius I had dared to complain to Bishop Ambrose and expelled them from the cities on 2 September 390 (this, however, already revoked on 17 April 392). Perhaps he had remembered a text of Libanios, the highly esteemed, the declared pagan (of whom we possess many speeches, over 1500 letters, which make him one of the best documented people of antiquity), a passage about the monks, the ones so fervently admired by the Christians, who nevertheless "eat more than the elephants, empty numerous cups" and themselves only "cleverly hide their own way of life under artificially pale paint". So, Libanios complains in 389 in his writing "Pro templis" addressed to the ruler, they rush forward like torrents and devastate the country by destroying all temples. "They storm the sanctuaries, emperor, although your law still exists, loaded with logs or armed with stones and swords, some even without these things, merely with hands and feet. Then, as if it were ownerless property, they tear down the roofs, overthrow the walls, smash the images of the gods, smash the altars. The priests have only the choice between silence and death. Once the first temple is destroyed, they rush to the second and the third, heaping trophy upon trophy, mocking the law."107

Temple demolitions required state approval.

St.

Shenute as a Pagan Fighter 209

For Syria, the exterminations are ordered by law in 399, but in the West, where the Roman aristocracy still represents the old religion, the temples are protected by law in the same year, though in 407 a

constitution under Stilicho confiscates all pagan sanctuaries in the territory of Rome. In the East, in 435, Theodosius II decreed the definitive closure of the temples, exorcism, destruction. But even this should be done without much fuss (*sine turba ac tumultu*). And since the authorities, officials, soldiers, often tolerated paganism more than the decrees made under clerical pressure allowed, clergy and people also went unauthorized to temple exterminations – ancient "crystal nights" – or, as the euphemistic artificial word is, to "Christianization"; "often", Jesuit Grisar wants to make believe, or even "mainly as a result of the tumults started by the pagans". Especially in the eastern provinces, where Christianity predominated and the pagan resistance, in the double sense of the word, was only "academic" (Jones), more and more temples were ruined already in the second half of the 4th century, whereby the fanatical masses not infrequently fell bloody upon the Old Believers. We know that they occasionally fought back; but we do not know much about it.¹⁰⁸

The terror, however, had long been literarily prepared, including by Schenute.

Following tried-and-true patterns, he pours invective on "idols" and "idol" worshippers—the worshippers of wood, stone, of "birds, crocodiles, wild beasts, and cattle." He mocks the lighting of lights and incense, which still flourishes today in Catholicism, only no longer for "gods" but, oh great difference, for "God" (and his "saints"). Schenute used a tactic that is still practiced in church circles, especially in Catholic circles: in front of the masses he denigrated, blasphemed crudely and primitively, thus increasing hatred, fanaticism. Before nobler circles he struck serious tones and sought, however difficult this might be for him, to win over opponents rather by fairness. "And how Schenute for the pagans and their worship hardly

ho The struggle for the episcopal chairs of the East

other sentiments than ridicule and scorn, so he exults in the often bloody war of persecution waged precisely in his day by the Christian mob against the last Hellenic priests. He praises the "righteous kings and generals" who destroyed the temples and overthrew the images of the gods. He rejoices that the statues ... are dragged away. He is amused by the mocking songs of the Christians about the pagans and their temples" (Leipoldt).¹⁰⁹

At that time and later, however, Schenute, the "great abbot", also devastated the country – an enemy of science, the worst hater of the Hellenes, a Catholic zealot who loudly praises all the powerful who destroy temples, statues of gods (and the latter at least has been "the order of the day" since Julian's murder: Funke). At the head of already almost soldierly drilled, by him appropriately stimulated, sufficiently starved ascetic heaps – meat, fish, eggs, cheese, wine were forbidden, almost only bread and only one meal daily were allowed – he penetrated into the temples, plundered, demolished them and threw the "idols" into the Nile. But everything that was valuable, that promised money, he took with him to his monastery. Still one year before he died allegedly 8-jährig, he haunted a temple in the Thebais in such a way. And so the theologian Leipoldt cannot avoid to call it nevertheless indisputable Schenute's "merit", "that after 450 in Upper Egypt the old gods were no longer worshipped".¹¹⁰ Repeatedly, the saint removed temples of his homeland with his own hand. "The example of his archbishop Cyril inspired him to achieve great success in this easy and convenient way," Leipoldt writes, reporting Schenute's burning of the pagan shrine in nearby Atriye. Or that of the temple in the village of Pnuit (Pleuit). "The pagans who witnessed his act did not dare to defend themselves. Some hurried away "like foxes fleeing from lions." The others limited themselves to pleading: "Take care of our places", i.e. spare the holy temple! Only a few found the courage to threaten Schenute: if he St. Shenute as a fighter of the pagans

If he had a well-founded claim, he could convey and enforce it through the court. In fact, at the last moment, even among Schenute's followers, voices were raised that, probably out of fear of possible evil consequences, advised peace. But Schenute believed he had to ignore them. He relied on the favor of his

archbishop and the Christian government and sought to complete the planned work. He stole from the temple all the portable objects, the sacred candlesticks, the magic books, the offerings, the bread vessels, the cultic utensils, the votive gifts, even the sacred images of the gods, and thus returned to the monastery with rich booty: perhaps Shenute was later accused, not without reason, of having appropriated the rich temple treasures in order to provide the monks with an extraordinary income in the bad economic times. Of course, the evil consequences of this act did not remain unnoticed. When a pagan hegemon came to Antinou, Shenute was sued there by the priests of the plundered temple. But if they had thought that the pagan official might agree with them, they were mistaken. They had forgotten how she was hated by the people and how Shenute was revered. In short, on the morning of the day of judgment, Shenute did not appear alone in Antinou. From all the villages and estates in the vicinity, Christians flocked to the city, men and women, in such numerous crowds that the roads could hardly contain them. Their numbers grew from hour to hour. Soon they were masters of all Antinou, the inhabitants of which were for the most part still pagans. And when the trial was about to begin, the whole assembled crowd cried out as one man: "Jesus! Jesus!" The roar of the people drowned out the voice of the judge: the trial was thwarted. Shenute, however, with loud shouts of triumph, was led into the so-called water church, where he preached a powerful sermon against the heathen. "111

But in addition to robbing, ruining, inciting the people, fleecing especially the wealthy Greek landlords, the economic master class, there was murder.¹¹²

in The Struggle for the Bishop's Chairs of the East.

Thus, in the burning of the great temple of Panopolis, the rich leader of the pagans was liquidated. And since the abbot also penetrated into the houses of the other Notabein, in order to destroy all kinds of gods and devil stuff, to "clean" the area, one slaughtered also there. And after Shenute one night in Akhmin had visited the house of Gesios, who had just gone away, and had hurled his "idols" smashed into the stream, but the robbed had complained to the governor, the "Life of Shenute" reports: "since Jesus took away his riches, nobody has heard of him again" – the standing formula obviously for the murderous deeds of the saint. Even when, as he himself confesses, he and his monks smashed a much-visited pagan statue of Akhmins, robbed the city, set it on fire, massacred the inhabitants, they met, says Shenute, the fate of Gesios, "they were never heard of again, and after the massacre their bones were scattered to the wind..." – "A hard, rough, heated, but also captivating and stirring.... character," for whom "only the practical" applied: "obeying God and doing his work" (Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche).¹¹³

Still in Altaner's "Patrology," a standard work of Catholic theology as well, Shenute figures (with imprimatur in 1978) as "the most powerful organizer of Egyptian monasticism," "the most important writer of national Coptic Christianity." Ernst Stein, too, praises the abbot as the most outstanding intellectual man of his people, the "hero of Coptic writing," but adds that he gives us "in his intellectual low level and his crudeness, which did not shrink from single-handed murder and manslaughter, a yardstick by which we can measure the spiritual misery of his nation." ¹¹⁴

The Eutychian Controversy zij

The Eutychian Controversy

A few years after the Union trade (433), this monstrous scandal, Nestorios was languishing in the desert, and his antipodes, the friend and traitor John, St. Cyril, were no longer alive. But the opposition continued and brought down Alexandria as well. The Monophysite controversy, however, which replaced the Arian one in the 5th century, divided the Church and Christianity even more deeply. Of course, grotesquely enough, the Monophysite "heretics", the followers of the "Mia-physis"-formula, could essentially refer to St. Cyril, since they largely "taught nothing else than the Cyrillian-Alexandrian Christology" (the Jesuits Grillmeier/Bacht). Thus, this church teacher moves into the

closest proximity to the most popular "heresy" of the East in ancient Christian times, if he was not even, as some researchers think, its most influential promoter.¹¹⁵

In Constantinople, Nestorios had been followed in 431 by the "zero" Maximian (p. 186), in 434 by the ambitious Proclus, who had run three times in vain for the episcopal see, and finally, after the latter's death in 446, by the more upright yet weak Flavian. In Antioch, in a proven cultivation of clerical nepotism, on John's death in 442 his nephew Domnos became patriarch, advised mainly by Theodoret, the most important theologian of the school there, but of somewhat shaky "orthodoxy." In Alexandria, since Cyril's demise on June 27, 444, his successor Dioskor ruled, waging the traditional power struggle against Constantinople and espousing an ultra-Cyrrillic theology - "unrestrainedly ambitious and ruthless to the point of brutality, supported in this by imperial military and fanatical, powerful clusters of monks" (Schwaiger). Catholics almost

unanimously see in Dioskor one of the most unpleasant bishop figures of the 5th century. But it is no coincidence, but consistent, that just Cyril had appointed him as his archdeacon and had given him special confidence. They were both cut from the same cloth. To which it is quite fitting that

xi4 The struggle for the bishoprics of the East

Dioskor accused his patron Cyril of squandering the church treasury immediately after the latter's death (cf. pp. 182 ff), that he confiscated his estate and excluded several of his relatives from the clergy.¹¹⁶

Incidentally, in his struggle against Constantinople, Dioskor, like Cyril, attacked at the same time the patriarch of the capital and Antiochian theology. But the noose laid for the two opponents he finally tightened himself, above all probably because he had not laid it, like Cyril, in alliance with Rome, but believed that he could also win against Rome.

On the side of the Alexandrian, two influential personalities of Constantinople fought, the court eunuch Chrysaphius and the archimandrite Eutyches.

Since Chrysaphius had succeeded in 441 in banishing the empress Eudokia and eliminating the emperor's sister Pulcheria, he had steered the policy of Theodosius II. The powerful eunuch, however, was at enmity with the city's patriarch, Flavian. In recognition of his election, Chrysaphius had not received an appropriate gift, but only consecrated bread, which he promptly returned with the wish that he had an appetite for gold. Third in the alliance: Archimandrite Eutyches, head of a large monastery near Constantinople, highly respected in the East and godfather of the all-powerful eunuch. The illustrious cloverleaf sought to liquidate the "Union" of 433 and to enforce the infamous "Twelve Anathematisms" of Cyril as a guideline of the "right faith" against the Antiochian theology that was then - admittedly shamelessly - triumphant. Patriarch Dioskor of Alexandria was to regain primacy over Patriarch Flavian of Constantinople.¹¹⁷

The maneuver was initiated by the ancient abbot Eutyches.

Catholics like to portray him as dogmatically unsound, as a theological fool. But of course, in the question of God, some knew and know as little as others, may some be more glib, more shrewd, more unscrupulous, and for any reason that cannot be reconciled with logic or probity or the slightest empirically grounded knowledge - whence

The Eutychian Controversy 215

then! - have to do with logic, honesty, or the least empirical knowledge. "Well-founded," at any rate, is nothing here. The whole thing hangs baselessly in the air, a pure mirror fencing out of nomenclatures, a "mere idea," with Kant, a "mere groping about, and, what is worst, under mere concepts." Is there anything more philosophically shameful than the necessity of still having to say this? "8

According to Eutyches, the new theological spectacle that now erupted and was soon to shake half the world was called the Eutychian controversy, breaking for the first time the traditional alliance between Rome and Alexandria.^{11'}

Eutyches, a monk from his youth and with a reputation for special piety, was suspected of 'heresy'. And Pope Leo, who had at first praised his zeal, finally threatened him with the fate of those whose "heresies" he had followed, if he remained "lying in the filth of his folly". Eutyches, in fact, denied the faith that assumed in Christ "two natures after union." He increased the doctrine of the union of the divine and human natures, propagated by the Alexandrian school, to its complete mixture, to monophysitism. This Christological variety went back to the heretical bishop Apollinaris of Lao-dicea (d. after 390), who, in disputing the union of the two natures in the Lord, restricted the human one, which at that time did not yet drive the Orthodox to the barricades. It was possible to copy and spread a whole series of writings of the "heretical" bishop under the names of "orthodox" Church Fathers, which today seems so comforting to the theologian Heinrich Kraft, because it shows (among other things) "how little also [!] the ancients understood of the things about which they disputed with such passion"! In reality, just what makes a mockery of every experience, is based on nothing but fictions, in German Hirngespinnsten, cannot be understood. In short, Monophysitism, in order to secure the unity of the person of the Lord, denies the completeness of his human nature, either - according to the more moderate "heretics" - since the Resurrection or - according to the radical ones - since his Incarnation, 216 The struggle for the episcopal chairs of the East.

which boils down to the difference of his human nature from ours.

If Nestorios allegedly urged to separate the divine and the human in Christ, to distinguish the divine personality from the human, Eutyches taught that the divine and the human were inseparably blended therein, the human merged in the divine - precisely: "one nature after union," the Mia-physis formula which Eutyches had adopted from St. Cyril! The whole Eutychianism, Camelot concedes, "lives on the intolerant fidelity to Cyril's formulations, especially to the formula of <one nature>". The Monophysites, after the Incarnation hur, recognized Christ as having one, the divine nature (mia kai mone physis). Eutyches thus denied the humanity of Christ. He declared it as transformed into the Godhead, "as a drop of honey is absorbed in the waters of the sea". Against this now again the Antiochians - who had fallen down so much at the "Union" in 433 - stood up. Their new patriarch Domnos, the nephew and successor of John, protested to the emperor against the heresies and calumnies of the monk Eutyches.120

Now Patriarch Dioskoros I of Alexandria (444-451) intervened. The successor of St. Cyril, who called himself simply "Emperor of Egypt," forced the nepots of his predecessor to hand over the riches hoarded under him, but did not do otherwise. Like the latter, he led "a true regiment of terror," and was "even [!] not impeccable from a moral point of view" (Ehrhard). Like Kyrill, he had his informers and accomplices at the imperial court. And like Cyril (and like many bishops) he used especially the monks for his power-political goals, thus, curiously enough, just that Christian community which had originated as an escape from the world! In Christianity all original "ideals" sooner than later turned into the opposite. Protected by his bodyguards, Archbishop Dioskor, a saint for the Monophysites, ruled by naked force and helped in the exercise of his spiritual jurisdiction by hired mortars when necessary.

The Eutychian Controversy 117

der. His own clergy, ruthlessly tyrannized by him, eventually accused him of wanting to rule the country himself instead of the emperor (Marcian).121

The patriarch soon found himself in an increasingly heated epistolary feud with his Antiochian colleague, behind which, of course, lay the old rivalry between the two patriarchates, and all the more so now that on the chair in Constantinople sat Flavian, an Antiochian. "Dioscor," wrote church historian Theodo-ret, bishop of Cyrus, on behalf of the Antiochian patriarch Domnos, "refers us at one and the same time to the chair of St. Marcus, and yet knows that the great city of Antioch has the chair of St. Peter, who was the teacher of St. Marcus and, on top of that, first and chief of all the apostles."122

The protest went to the chief shepherd of Constantinople, Flavian, urging His "Holiness" "not to let the sacred canons be trampled underfoot with impunity, but to contend courageously for the faith." But Flavian, a rather modest and timid man – whom the ecclesiastical historiography likes to call "irenica" and all the better because a prince of the church cannot honestly be called so often – did not want to compete with the powerful monk-head of his sprengel. Eutyches used him, so Nestorios wrote, still in the exile attentively following the battlefield, "like a servant". Only when Bishop Eusebios of Dorylaion (Phrygia), a feared hothead who smelled "heresy" all around and who had once also denounced Nestorios, a man for whom, as Flavian moaned, "in his zeal for the faith the fire itself is too cold," also appeared against Eutyches, did he have to intervene and in November 448 cited Eutyches before the Synodos endemousa.¹²³

Eutyches was first prevented by a vow, then by illness. Only after the third summons – according to valid canon law, summons to appear before a synodal court had to be issued three times – did he appear at the seventh and final session on November 22, 448, accompanied by a crowd of monks, military personnel, and officials of the Prefect of the Guard. The man, who claimed to have lived in his cell as if it were a tomb, wore a coat during the

218 The Struggle for the Bishop's Chairs of the East.

process "the demeanor of a cloistered man far removed from the world" who, so to speak, "could not leave his cloister for professional reasons," but was "in reality closely connected with church-political current events for decades." Thus Jesuit Bacht characterizes a behavior that *mutatis mutandis* is virtually classic for the hypocrisy of innumerable church leaders in old and new times.¹²⁴

Eutyches referred to the faith of St. Athanasius as well as of St. Cyril and represented an unambiguous, yes, extremely monophysite position: certainly Christ was true man, but his flesh was not similar in essence to human flesh. It is true that he consisted of two natures before the incarnation, but not afterwards. Rather from his two natures at the moment of the incarnation a divine nature (monophysis) had become. Tirelessly he repeated his Confiteor: "I confess that our Lord before the union consisted of two natures, after the union I confess only one nature". Even Pope Leo I, according to his own confession, did not

understand for a long time what was "erroneous" in the teaching of Eutyches! At first he even seemed to side with him, especially since he had been his benevolent ally already in the fight against the Nestorians. Patriarch Flavian, however, got up his courage and deposed Eutyches with the obligatory tears as a blasphemer of Christ. He stripped him of his abbacy and priesthood, put him under ban, and sent the records (*gesta*) of the trial, signed by 32 bishops and (subsequently!) 23 archimandrites and abbots, to Rome. Everything, his "burden of sorrow and the multitude of tears", he laid down before Pope Leo. The latter at first had little sympathy for Flavian – if only because of the chronic suspicion of the Roman bishops towards the ambition of their colleagues in Constantinople. Also, Flavian had probably deliberately delayed sending the files to Rome. In June 449, however, Leo I also condemned Eutyches and his "perverse and foolish error." He now called the monk's head, who stood in the odor of great sanctity and was then already almost seventy years old (such a fierce Antinestorian and friend of Cyril that Cyril gave him a copy of the Council's

The Eutychian Controversy 119

Acts of Ephesus sent to him) was not only "senex imperitus" but also "stultissimus," a silly man who knew neither the Scriptures nor even the beginning of the Creed.¹²⁵

The "wolf of heresy," however, did not give up. He sent letters all over the world, to the bishops of Ravenna, Alexandria, Jerusalem, Thessalonica, to the "defenders of religion" – only the epistle to Pope Leo I is still preserved, in which Eutyches calls everything a put-up job and also says: "even my life was in danger, if not by God's help at Your Holiness' prayer" (a probably intentional misunderstanding)

"military help would have snatched me from the furious onslaught of the mob." He enclosed his profession of faith. He put together a florilegium of "Fathers" quotations with loud condemnations of the duality of natures. Yes, he tried to influence the population by means of wall postings, which Patriarch Flavian had removed immediately. But Eutyches found support in Emperor Theodosius II, whose ear he had through his confessor, the all-powerful eunuch Chrysaphius. And with the emperor, together with the Alexandrian archbishop Dioskor, they now also pushed through the enormously elaborate enterprise of an imperial council in Ephesus – to strengthen the right faith, as the regent emphasized in his convocation decree of March 30, 449. In vain, the foreboding Flavian, allied now with Pope Leo I, who likewise, on May 16, received an invitation, wanted to thwart the pious assembly.¹²⁶

The fight for the bishop's chairs of the East

The "Robber Synod" of Ephesus 449

The imperial synod of Ephesus, convened by the emperor on August 1, was not constituted with about 130 bishops until August 8, 449. They met again, as they had in 431 (pp. 172 ff), in the Church of St. Mary, the site of the Cyrillian victory. According to the imperial order, the Alexandrian Dioskor, with whom Pope Leo I had initially maintained good relations and to whom he had expressed his respect and affection, combined with the hope for further prosperous understanding between Rome and Alexandria, presided – according to established practice with twenty vassal bishops. "We wish," he had written to him on July 21, 445, "to establish more firmly your beginnings, that you may lack nothing for perfection, since, as we have proved, the merit of spiritual grace is at your side." However, when spiritual grace was with the devil, he sneered at him a "new Pharaoh," as Cyril was already called. The only nature in Christ, the rehabilitation of Eutyches – the revenge for his damnation in the last year –, the deposition of Flavian, the elimination of all "Nestorians" were decided. Two imperial commissioners, the Comes of the Sacred Consistory Elpidios and the Tribune Eulogios, with firm synodal marching orders and strong military contingent appeared, supervised everything. Theodoret of Cyrus, the most important theological potency of the opponents, was forbidden to participate at all. And the council fathers of the "endemic" synod of the autumn before together with all kinds of other bishops, altogether 42, were not given the right to vote. Dioskor himself appeared with his monks as well as his armed bodyguard disguised as "nurses" (parabolans), who were "ready for any act of violence" (Caspar). As a precaution, he had also brought with him the Syrian archimandrite Barsumas (Bar Sauma), a well-known antinestorian whom an imperial letter designated as the deputy of the Oriental abbots at the council because of his virtue and orthodoxy. Barsumas, however, who, although not a bishop at all, was given a seat and a vote contrary to all tradition, was a friend of Eutyches, and both accompanied

The "Robber Synod" of Ephesus 449 2x1

considerable mobs of sturdy monks armed with knuckles – Barsumas allegedly a thousand. In any case, the monastic hordes proved extremely useful during the various council phases.¹²⁷

Much less useful were undoubtedly the three legates of Leo I (ignorant of Greek and dependent on the interpreting Bishop Florentius of Sardis), Bishop Julius of Puteoli, Deacon Hilarus, the subsequent pope, and the secretary Dulcitius. (A fourth legate, the priest Renatus, supposedly the most important man, had died on the journey to Delos). Leo's envoys had brought letters to various notables of Constantinople, including the emperor, whom he tried in vain to dissuade from the council. Finally, among Leo's mail was the "Epistola dogmatica ad Flavianum," the so-called *Tomus Leonis*, a dogmatic declaration by the Roman that championed in the sharpest terms the permanent distinctness of the two natures of the Incarnate: "unity of person" and "duality of natures" – by which the pope contrasted with Church teacher Cyril, who often spoke of "two natures" before union and of "one nature" afterward, indeed, who explicitly spoke of the "one nature of the Incarnate Logos" (*mia physis toy logoy se-*

sarkomene), a doctrine that had been condemned as heresy by Roman Bishop Damasus (377 and 382) as well as by the Council of Constantinople (381). 128

Leo's Tomus – through the "heretic" Nestorios, who studied it in exile, saw his own doctrine confirmed – had indeed, according to later legend, been laid on the tomb of St. Peter and miraculously completed there, but was not read at all at the Council, which condemned the doctrine of the two natures in Christ "after the Incarnation." Dioskor rejected a corresponding attempt of the papal legates right at the beginning, and Juvenal supported him. One wanted to see everyone banished "who still speaks of two natures after the Incarnation". The Nestorian doctrine was considered worse than that of the devil. The mood was all for Dioskor and Alexandria. "Cyril immortal! Let Alexandria remain,

2.2.2.

The struggle for the episcopal chairs of the East

the city of the Orthodox," cried the Council Fathers. And "the whole world has recognized your faith, you in the world's only Dioskur".^{12'}

Leo's people, on the other hand, did not cut a very happy figure. After their first address, which was not exactly warmly received, they initially did not get a chance to speak at all. When, under Juvenal's lead, four fifths of the synod – 113 of the 140 or so participants – programmatically attested to Eutyches' orthodoxy, Bishop Julius of Puteoli abstained from voting. And in the vote against Flavian, as a result of various misunderstandings, the papal legates also agreed! Only when, after Flavian's condemnation (and that of the obsessive, wildly interposed litigator Eusebios of Dorylaion, a former lawyer from Alexandria), Flavian loudly protested and disputed Dioskor's "competence", Legate Hilarus also risked a brief veto by just blaring a "contradicitur" into the assembly – the climax of the papal delegation's performance.

But the workings of the Holy Spirit now took strange forms. A great noise and confusion arose. At Dioskor's beckoning to the military strongman, the doors were opened, soldiers with drawn swords entered, along with his bodyguard, the Alexandrian parabolani, raving monks, the shrieking crowd. Shouts echoed through the great Church of St. Mary: "If one speaks of two natures, let him be under the spell!" "Out with Eusebios! Burn him, burn him alive! In pieces let him be cut!" In pieces because he "divides Christ." Remarkably, in the "exclamations" and "acclamations" of the Council Fathers of the ancient Church, "the more unanimous and loud the shouts were, the stronger the influence of the Holy Spirit was seen at work" (Franciscan Goemans). Bishops crawled into dark corners or under the seats. Abbot Barsu-mas threatened Flavian, who tried to flee to the altar, shouting, "Strike Flavianus dead!" The Archbishop of Constantinople – who later still (by means of secret mail through Legate Hilarus) was able to appeal "to the seat of the Prince of the Apostles": "Necessity beckons," so

The "Robber Synod" of Ephesus 449 123

lifted up his letter, "that I duly refer to Your Holiness (sanctitatem vestram)," quickly appealing to her for help for the "endangered pious faith of the Fathers" – the Constantinople church leader sought for the time being to reach the altar for his protection, was allegedly pulled to the ground and kicked by Archbishop Dioskor, whereupon other synod members, but especially monks, spontaneously joined in and the maltreated Flavian – circumstances and date of his death are disputed – perhaps succumbed to his injuries a few days later on his way to exile in Hypaipa (Lydia). (If he was injured at all, which has been doubted even on the Catholic side, and was not first eliminated, as Chadwick tries to justify, by St. Pulcheria, who was helped by his death. At the following council

in Chalcedon it was also said that Dioskor had murdered Flavian or Barsumas had strangled him.

However: the Council Fathers declared Flavian, perhaps himself the victim of a saint, now in any case a holy martyr; feast: February 18). – And anno domini 1984, Frits van der Meer instructs us in his introduction to "The Early Church": "For today's Christian, the early church landscape is attractive

because he finds in it an undivided church: indeed a bilingual one, but a united one, self-confident, undaunted, and therefore convincing."

The Pope's legate, Deacon Hilarus, somewhat hastily recommended himself, leaving behind all his luggage ("omnibus suis"), and then, in Rome, in gratitude for his miraculous rescue, donated a chapel to the Apostle John, patron of Ephesus, which can still be admired in the Lateran: *Liberatori suo beato Johanni evangelistae Hilarus episcopus famulus Christi*.¹³⁰

Euseb of Dorylaion – deposed and heretical – had also escaped and turned to Leo, "the only help that remained for him besides the Lord".¹³¹

And Bishop Theodoret, who had also been fired in Ephesus, had three highly flattering letters delivered in Rome at once, a downright salacious epistle to the pope himself, a

zz4 The Struggle for the Bishop's Chair of the East

to Archdeacon Hilarus, Leo's successor, and one even to the already dead presbyter Renatus (p. 221), whom he begged: "Persuade the most holy (Roman) archbishop to use apostolic power," while he praised his most holy see "above all" for having "remained (always) untouched by heretical stench".¹³¹

The Imperial Synod of Ephesus became a tremendous triumph of the Monophysites and Dioskor, who had an even more secure grip on the council than his predecessor, St. Cyril, had on that of Ephesus barely two decades earlier. Dioskor no longer needed the support of the Roman bishop, as did Cyril, but rather put him in his place and was himself now, with the help of the emperor, who confirmed the decisions of the synod, "actually master of the Church" (Aland). 113 of the "fathers" present had declared Eutyches to be of right faith and rehabilitated him, but deposed Flavian, sweeping away the "union" of 433. Pope Leo, of course, banished Dioskor, scolding his action "not a judgment" but "a frenzy," the council "non iudicium, sed latrocinium," a "robber synod," an assembly that "under the guise of religion was concerned with private interests (*privatae causae*)," which could be said of all church history, indeed, of every single believer. Also, not only the Patriarch of Constantinople, but also the Patriarch of Antioch, Domnos II (442–449), Eusebios and Bishop Ibas of Edessa (restituted at Chalcedon, but condemned again a hundred years later, at the "Three Chapter Controversy", 553), in short, all the leading Antiochian prelates, including Theodoret, were deposed and condemned and went into exile. The chairs of the most distinguished Eastern churches, however, were ascended by partisans of Dioskor, who also excommunicated Leo I, though supported only by ten Egyptian bishops—a victory Alexandria had hardly ever achieved before.¹³³

The pope now addressed a letter by mail of October 13, 449, to the "mild majesty," the "most Christian and venerable emperor," Theodosius, at first boldly claiming that everything would have been different had his directives been followed

The "Robber Synod" of Ephesus 449 225

would have been followed. For if the reading of his letter to "the holy synod" (which he also called the "robbers' synod") had not been deceived, then, by expounding his "unadulterated faith, which we owe to the inspiration of heaven and which we faithfully hold, the clashing of crossed arms would have ceased, theological ignorance" – as if there were anything else in theology! – "would have been scared away, and clerical jealousy" – which flourishes to this day – "would no longer have found a sham reason for its harmful work." Yes, the pope chided "that not all the participants in the council were present when the sentence was passed." As already in 431 at Ephesus (p. 175 ff)! "We have been told that some were simply not admitted, that others were smuggled in who, with a slavishly willing hand" – they need not have been bishops! – "submitting to the arbitrariness ... to the arbitrariness, put down their godless signatures, since they knew exactly that it was over with their position if they did not submit to his (Dioskor's) command." As if even that would be different in Catholic-governed councils!¹³⁴

So Pope Leo insisted on reversing "this wicked false judgment, which transcends all sacrileges." The

devil plays along with certain unwise people so much "that he advises them to poison where they seek a medicine. Oh, Leo's heart twitches. He asks His Majesty for a council "on Italian soil" to settle all disputes and restore brotherly love. The Roman also generously wants to admit the bishops of the Orient; he even wants to lead those who have strayed from the right path of the truth of faith "back to health with a healing remedy. "Even if one had fallen into more persistent offenses, he should not lose his unity with the Church if he accepts better insight. If not, of course, he must swallow the Catholic poison, and it is likewise "over" with his "position". Here, one side is not inferior to the other in corruption and greed for power.¹³³

However, no matter how much the pope condemned the council's decisions, considered them downright crimes, deadly

zz6 The Struggle for the Bishop's Chairs of the East

offended, he dared neither publicly in person nor through a synod to challenge or even overturn the Ephesian judgment. It would have contradicted imperial church law - "jurisdictional primacy" over the universal church or not. And when he later sent a part of the Chalcedon records to Gaul, the *exemplar sententiae*, the wording of the sentence passed on Dioscor, he did not hesitate to simply erase Dioscor's anathema hurled against himself among the reasons for the verdict: the Western bishops should not even be made aware of this tremendous possibility.¹³⁶

Certainly Leo appealed urgently to the emperor. Again and again he wrote, "I beseech you," "Let not the burden of a foreign sin be laid upon you!", "Free your pious conscience from guilt." He implored him "before the one threefold Godhead ... and before the holy angels of Christ." He pleaded with all his bishops, with all the churches of "our hemisphere." He invoked the "mild majesty with tears." He apostrophized her "most Christian and genuflectingly venerated Emperor." But he also wrote to St. Flavian (by now admittedly different), to the clergy, the monks of Constantinople, the citizens of that city, to bishops in the Orient, in Italy, Gaul. All he called to fight for Catholicism. In particular, however, he threw himself behind Pulcheria, the eldest, domineeringly bigoted sister of the emperor, whom she had brought up all the more Christian because she herself had taken the vow of virginity and had also induced her sisters to do so. Since she "always supports the efforts of the Church", the Pope asked her to intervene with Theodosius "by virtue of a special legation conferred upon her by the most blessed Apostle Peter". And the deacon Hilarus, who had escaped so miraculously in Ephesus, also enclosed a letter to Pulcheria. The (false) nun was apparently considered Rome's most important figure in the Constantinople imperial household.

But the ruler himself firmly backed Dioscor. Even when Leo I, through four letters - requested by him on the feast of the "Cathedra Petri", on February 22, in St. Peter's Church - Emperor Valentinian III, his mother Galla Placidia, sei-

The "Robber Synod" of Ephesus 449 2x7

n his wife Licinia Eudoxia, the daughter of Theodosius II, and his, Valentinian's, sister, trying to persuade the "mild majesty" in Eastern Rome to revoke the imperial synodal sentence of Ephesus, "mixing words with tears", as the high ladies write, "hardly able to speak because of sadness", Theodosius remained firm. The epistles of the court - Leo had cleverly engineered this - dripped with devotion to the Roman See, to be sure, which had the dignity "above all"; they were more papal than the pope. But Theodosius forbade any interference by "Patriarch Leo" in the affairs of the East, calling the synod the "divine judgment" and its outcome "the pure truth." Flavian, "guilty of harmful innovations," had received due punishment. "After he is removed, there is peace and complete unanimity in the churches ____" Successor of "blessed Flavian," whom a consolatory cry of ben of Leo had failed to reach, was a creature of Dioscor, his own presbyter, the Alexandrian apocrisiarch at court, Anatolius, who in turn again enthroned the partisan Maximus in Antioch.¹³⁷

But now that Dioscorus of Alexandria was preparing to command the entire Church of the East, he fell from all heights of triumph. A simple accident of misfortune led to a complete change in imperial and ecclesiastical policy.

On July 28, 450, the emperor Theodosius II, the stubborn opponent of the pope, who strengthened the Monophysites until the end and was only 49 years old, succumbed to a fall from his horse while hunting. He left no son. St. Pulcheria, his sanctimonious sister, once ousted from the political stage by Chrysaphios, seized the reins of the state and straightaway had the all-dominant eunuch, colluding with the Alexandrian patriarch, jumped ship – the first act of the new government – as well as dragging Eutyches from his monastery and interning him near Constantinople. And Pope Leo saw abruptly "by God's grace the freedom of the Catholics increased considerably".

In fact, now under the command of the army commander Aspar, the
tz8 The Struggle for the Bishops' Chairs of the East, General Marcian (450–457), who had been brought to power on August 25, married

by the 51-year-old, still and still virgin St. Pulcheria in August and made co-regent, the wind completely changed. Repeatedly, the new man, as Prosper writes, "also closely connected with the Church," an avowed opponent of the Monophy-sites and little more than the empress's willing creature, offered the pope a council "for the peace of the Christian religion and the Catholic faith." But Leo, who now knows the ruler is on his side, no longer needs a council. God has chosen him "to defend the faith," he writes Marcian, but implores him by the Lord Jesus Christ not to let that faith be discussed by a council in the first place. Now Flavian's body was solemnly buried in Constantinople Cathedral, Abbot Eutyches was excommunicated at a local synod, the hitherto victorious Alexandrian Patriarch Dioskor was accused of being a blasphemer of the Holy Trinity, a "heretic," a desecrator of relics, a thief, a murderer, et cetera, and Alexandria was "again the scene of bloody battles born of intolerance" (Schultze). And immediately the bishops turned away from Dioskor like one heart and soul, put all the blame on him and affirmed that they had only given way to violence. Anatolios (449–458), made patriarch of Constantinople by Dioskor, also immediately crawled to the cross under the strong pressure of the married "nun", to the Roman one this time, abandoned his own promoter Dioskor and sent a bunch of repentance declarations of Ephesian synodals to Rome, but nevertheless played a double game. Likewise, the Antiochian Patriarch Maximus collected statements of condemnation against Nestorios and Eutyches. Even Dioskor's own archdeacon fell away from him and, as mentioned, became patriarch in Alexandria.¹³⁸

However, the patriarchate, having passed from triumph to triumph through three generations in the struggle for the Eastern Church, had lost its dominant position; indeed, had finally failed with its lust for power. Henceforth, the rival in Constantinople led unchallenged with a sphere of several

The Council of Chalcedon 229

hundred bishoprics. He far surpassed Alexandria and Antioch, but also the bishop of Rome, who ruled only the greater part of Italy and Illyria, but who also eagerly pulled his strings to the East, where not everything went as he would have liked.

The Council of Chalcedon or: "We cry out for the sake of piety".

As late as June 9, 451, Leo asked Emperor Marcian to postpone the council in consideration of the war turmoil. But Marcian had already decided otherwise. And so it came to the famous fourth ecumenical council, which continued to have an effect for centuries, no less concocted than the previous "Robber Synod" and, at least occasionally, no less turbulent.

As usual, the emperor had called it and opened his letter of invitation of May 17, 451, to all the metropolitans with the sentence: "Divine things are to be put before all matters. The monarch had also, without asking any bishop or "pope", fixed the time and place (first Nicaea, then Chalcedon, today:

Kadikoy, on the Bosphorus, opposite Constantinople) – quite naturally at that time. And as a matter of course, Pope Leo I, "the Great", complied without any objection, even though he did not want the synod at all, but rather repeatedly expressed his disapproval and incessantly emphasized that in calm times he would have liked to hold a council in Italy. But faced with a fait accompli, he wrote in his welcoming epistle to the episcopal assembly (June 26, 451): "The pious counsel of the most illustrious Lord, by which he has called you together for the destruction of the snares of the devil and the restoration of ecclesiastical peace, is to be approved, respecting the right and honor of the most blessed Apostle Peter, in that by his letter he has also called us to it.

230 The struggle for the episcopal sees of the East

to give our presence to the venerable Synod. This, of course, neither the necessity of the times nor any ancient custom permitted; but in the brethren ... who are sent from the apostolic see, may your brotherhood consider me as presiding (praesidere) over your synod. "13'

Now Leo's legates did come: the bishops Paschasius of Lilybäum (Marsala/Sicily), his special confidant, for whom he demanded the presidency "vice apostolica", and Lucentius of Ascoli, the Roman priest Boniface and a scribe, and as advisor Julian of Kios, the expert on the East. But they were only able to read out the papal letter of welcome at all at a special session towards the end of the Council! And when they met in the Basilica of St. Euphemia on October 8, 451, the Emperor's plenipotentiaries, consuls, senators, prefects, no less than eighteen, presided – in the middle of the nave – yes, the Emperor himself intervened authoritatively in the sessions several times from his "divine palace", also presided over the one on October 25 with the Empress herself and approved the decisions, making them valid. And Pius XII. The assertion in his encyclical "Sempiternus Rex Christus" on the occasion of the 1500th anniversary in 1951 that the Church Assembly had met under the chairmanship of the papal legates and that all the Council Fathers had recognized this prerogative of Rome is just as untrue as the statement of Pius XI. in his encyclical "Lux veritatis" in 1931 on the occasion of the 1500th anniversary of the Council of Ephesus (p. 172) – not to mention many other tendentious distortions and falsifications of history of the Pacelli circular in the service of Roman claims to primacy.¹⁴⁰

But Catholic theologians lie from the top to the more modest ranks, up to, for example – with "imprimatur" – the Jesuit Jacob Linden: "At the general councils the popes or their deputies always [!] presided." Or up to the – with "imprimatur" – Catholic apologists Koch/ Siebengartner: "Never has a general church council been held without the pope or his deputies presiding.

The Council of Chalcedon 131

had presided over it". Until the Catholic J. P. Kirsch (with imprimatur): "The presidents of the synod were the papal legates". Up to the Catholic "Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche": "the chair was held by a papal legate". No wonder, already in Chalcedon itself the legate Lucentius claimed against Dioskor: "He dared to hold a synod without the authority of the Holy See, which was never allowed and never happened." Thus Catholics – cf. p. 88 f – lie to the face of the whole world through two millennia.¹⁴¹ Pope Leo I did claim for himself the right of the presidency at the Council of 451 – but he did not have it! He requested Emperor Marcian that Paschasius preside instead of him ("vice mea"), also wrote to the bishops in distant Gaul that his "brothers" "preside in my place at the Oriental synod". Of course, they were allowed to do so only on one single day! , 2nd, 4th, 5th session – in the 6th (October 25), which solemnly confirmed the Formula of Faith of Chalcedon, the Emperor and Empress Pulcheria themselves had appeared – and that their commissioners also "presided ... in the 8th–17th session". Indeed, they had a firm grip on the Council. And they – and no one else – also saved it again and again in its critical phases.¹⁴²

Certainly, even through the representatives of the ruler, the Holy Spirit spoke precisely – as he always speaks, it is in favor of the Roman Church. And if it is otherwise, then the devil speaks. (Why the Holy

Spirit allows at all that also the devil speaks, that also to the disadvantage of the Roman church is spoken and decided – even on councils recognized by Rome, even on "ecumenical" councils, like the Council of Constantinople [381], yes, on that, as will be shown, of Chalcedon –, that is the mystery of the Holy Spirit).

131 The struggle for the episcopal sees of the East.

Leo I also did not want to have the question of faith debated in the least. Such debates, real disputes, even in the dogmatic, are never convenient for popes. There can be no doubt about it, Leo wrote to the Council Fathers in his welcoming letter, "what I wish. Therefore, dearest brethren, the temerity of debating against the divinely inspired faith is utterly rejected, the vain unbelief of the erring is silenced, and it is forbidden that what may not be believed should be defended..." And in a last letter of July 20, he implored Emperor Marcian: "Not even the slightest disputation of any resumption of the proceedings!"¹⁴³

But as little as one fulfilled the Pope's wish for the presidency of the Council, as little one obeyed his demand: no discussion of faith! On the contrary, the imperial commissioners expressly insisted on it. But the creed drafted by the Council Committee itself met with passionate rejection at the 5th session (October 22). The papal legates threatened to return and hold a council in Italy. The emperor put pressure on the synodals: either a new formula of faith or a transfer of the synod to the pope's country. Now they preferred to have a new formula of faith. The bishops complied and drew up their own definition of faith, incorporating Leo's doctrinal letters. But this was accepted not because they recognized a doctrinal authority of the Roman, but because they were convinced that his "Tomos" was in accordance with the Orthodox faith.¹⁴⁴

The Council, a triumph of Orthodoxy, was one of the most pompous assemblies of the ancient Church, supposedly consisting of 600 bishops. Cardinal Hergenrother gives a figure of "520 to 630" participants. However, in the Council records – which do not always transmit the sessions (praxeis, actiones) in chronological order and in mostly divergent counts – there are only 452 signatures. And in reality "only 350 to 360 fathers were present" (Franciscan Goemans). In the first session (October 8) Patriarch Dioskor was indicted,

Council of Chalcedon 133 dethroned in the third session (October 13), but his teaching was not condemned!

Dioskor was careful not to appear again, but for his part still excommunicated the pope. The council deprived him of his episcopal see and all spiritual dignities (the emperor later exiled him; first to Cyzicus, then to Heracleia, finally to Gangra in Paphlagonia, where he died in exile a few years later). A malefactor not to lose any more – the tactic already against Nestorios. Incidentally, the Assembly, fearing reprisals, recognized the very formula that the Emperor Marcian, presiding over the Council – acclaimed as "Novus David", "Novus Paulus", "Novus Constantinus", indeed, as "priest" and "teacher of the faith" (!) – that the Pope and the Patriarch of Constantinople, Anatolius, desired: the Diophysite doctrine that had become the basis of all Orthodox theology, Greek, Catholic, Protestant: one Christ in two natures.¹⁴⁵

For just as the Nicaean Creed had already come about at the Council of Nicaea merely through the Emperor Constantine, which is why Johannes Haller derided it as the Constantinian, so too the formula defined at Chalcedon had been adopted "only under the most intense influence of politics. only a threatening ultimatum of the emperor brought it about that the question of the relationship between divine and human nature in Christ was decided unequivocally and finally and laid down in the form of a formulated confession by the synod" (Kawerau). Even Leo I acknowledged to the emperor the main merit in the victory of the synod over the new "heresy", "since through the holy ... zeal of your clemency the most pernicious error was destroyed....",¹⁴⁶

The ruler, then, later stood decisively behind the symbol, and the Nestorian Metropolitan Elias of Nisibis (975–1049) might not be so wrong, writing in his book of the "Proof of the Truth of the Faith": "But the emperor said: <There are neither two persons to be assumed with Nestorios, nor one nature with Dioskoros and his comrades, but two natures and one person." Which he had so commanded,

2.34 The struggle for the episcopal chairs of the East

he upheld by force, and slew the gainsayers with the sword, saying, "The one evil is less than the other!".... Our people ... taught that the view established by the emperor was reprehensible and corrupt, that he was not in the truth, and held fast to their old, orthodox faith, which had not been changed, which had not given rise to any violence, for which there had been no mediation, no donation of gifts, whereby expenditure of money had not taken place.... , "147

The majority of the Council Fathers, however, hardly understood what was at stake theologically. The intellectual caliber of many of them is strikingly illuminated by the fact that at the Synod of Antioch (324/325), according to a clerical document, most of the bishops were not even "expert in matters of ecclesiastical faith"! That in 449 at the Synod of Ephesus several bishops could not even write their own names and had their signatures given by others! That also at the Council of Chalcedon forty illiterate bishops met! Even a modern Catholic emphasizes the uncommonly low level on which "the Eastern Roman episcopate largely stood" (Haacke). But was it different with the Western Roman one?

Acknowledgedly even worse!148

Admittedly, also the formula "one Christ in two natures" could not be grasped by anyone. A distinction without separation, a union without mixture! Certainly a great mystery. Still today nobody understands it. One suspects this in the explanation of the Benedictine Haacke (who compares the Monophysites "with the National Socialists"): "Against the Monophysite mixture one emphasized the admixture, against the distorted intimacy the most intimate togetherness"! But one just needed an absolutely divine Lord! And an absolutely human one! And above all a bishop's see!149

The reading of Leo's doctrinal letter – epistola dogmatica, in the East Tomos Leos, in the Coptic historiography also called "Tomos of evil Leo" and completely fixed on an antialexandrian Christology – accompanied on the second Sit

The Council of Chalcedon Z35

day of the council, i.e. October, enthusiastic acclamations: "This is the faith of the Fathers, of the Apostles! We all believe so, the Orthodox believe so! Anathema to him who does not believe so! Peter spoke through Leo! The apostles taught so! Pious and true Leo taught! Cyril taught so! Eternal memory Cyril! Leo and Cyril taught the same! Anathema to him who does not so teach!" Not even the time for reflection until the next meeting, three days later, the high fighters for the faith wanted to accept:

"None of us doubts, we have already signed", they shouted – a triumph also of papal authority, which for four centuries, until 869/70 (Constantinople) was not surpassed at "ecumenical" councils?so

The formula "Peter spoke through Leo!" did not escape Catholic dogmatics and apologetics, the less so as it had resounded from the mouths of Oriental bishops. Whenever one served up historical "proofs" of the papal doctrinal authority, one also served them up. But, as the Catholic theologian and church historian Schwaiger writes: "On close study of the sources, however, the Council of Chalcedon nowhere refers to any unconditional doctrinal authority of the pope in justification of the acceptance of the Tomus Leonis.... Some of the bishops apparently accepted the Tomus Leonis only under massive imperial pressure. "151

The Leonian "masterpiece" – today undoubtedly far more suitable to remedy even the most severe insomnia more easily than even the mildest doubts of faith – reads, to give at least an idea of it, for long stretches like this: "The birth according to the flesh is the manifestation of human nature, but the giving birth of the Virgin is a sign of divine power. The infancy of the little one is shown in the lowliness of the

cradle, the greatness of the Most High is announced by the voice of the angels.... The devil's cunning tempts as men, the angels serve him as God. To hunger, to thirst, to be weary, to sleep is obviously human; but to feed five thousand with five loaves, to give living water to the Samaritan woman, that whoever

236 The struggle for the bishop's chair of the East

drinks, never thirsts again, walking on the back of the sea with non-sinking foot, smoothing the swelling floods by afflicting the storm, is unambiguously divine in nature. As, then, to pass over many things, it is not of one and the same nature to weep with lamenting love for one's dead friend, and to raise to life again the same who lay four days under the cover of the grave, by the command of his voice; or to hang upon the cross, and walk day in night, making the elements tremble; or to be pierced with nails, and to open the gates of Paradise to the believing avenger, so it is not of one and the same nature to say: <"I and the Father are one" and <"The Father is greater than I". "152

Well roared, lion, can hardly be said there.

It is not surprising that critical dogma historians like Harnack or Seeberg judged Leo's "Tomos" very disparagingly. It is more astonishing that Erich Caspar attributed "persuasive power" to it; a "convincing penetrating power for the widest circles" – certainly. For what in all the world would not have convinced the widest circles!153

Perhaps the papal attempt to explain something per se inexplicable, to concretize something taken freely out of thin air, cannot be better commented than with the advice that St. Jerome gave the priest Nepotian against declamers and garrulous tongues-waggers: "Let us leave it to the uneducated to throw empty words around and to draw the admiration of the inexperienced people to themselves through glibness. An unfortunately not uncommon presumption means to explain what one does not understand oneself; and in the end one considers oneself a light, if one has made others believe something. Nothing is easier than to deceive the common people and a plain assembly by a torrent of words; for the less they muster in factual understanding, the more their admiration grows. "154

Intellectually, the vast majority of the council's glittering ge-

The Council of Chalcedon 137

rope- even if not one in ten of the most reverend gentlemen had neither been able to write nor to read- was certainly a "plain assembly." But their mouths often worked all the better for it. After all, it was not always dogmatic problems that were rolled over, where one could fall silent for various reasons. Scandals were also dealt with, for example the disputes between the bishops Bassanos and Stephan of Ephesus. There were downright tumults, such scenes of the Fathers driven by the Holy Spirit, that even Catholic Georg Schwaiger compares the famous fourth ecumenical council "for long stretches" with the "robber synod" of Ephesus! Reinhold Seeberg, who registers an "exceedingly unpleasant impression", even emphasizes "that it was no less stormy than at the robbers' synod"; almost literally the same: Caspar. The minutes of the sessions make it clear that the synodalists were immersed in their own racket, that they would have failed quickly had the state not imposed its judicial-notorious procedure on them.155 The imperial commissioners rebuked the bishops' "rabble-rousing." The bishops screeched, "we are shouting for the sake of piety and Orthodoxy."

And while Dioskor – his situation was from the outset as hopeless as that of Nestorios in Ephesus in 431 – at least remained true to himself and stood by what he had advocated, the bishops, who had cheered him only two years before, now fell away from him almost as one man. At the very first meeting in the evening, already by candlelight, it was decided to depose him; unrestrainedly they gave him away. "Out with the murderer Dioskor!" they shouted, and at the third session, on October 13, when he was dethroned in absentia, they scolded him, "heretic," Origenist,

blasphemer of the Trinity, voluptuary, desecrator of relics, thief, arsonist, murderer, majesty criminal, and so on.¹⁵⁶

At the appearance of Barsumas, an avowed Nestorian, the same storm of indignation arose: "Out with the murderer!" The bishop of Cyzicus cried out, "He killed the blessed Flavianos. He stood there and shouted: Strike him dead!"

238 The struggle for the episcopal chairs of the East.

Andre chief shepherds cried out, "Barsumas has ruined all Syria." Barsumas remained quite unshaken by this. When church historian Bishop Theodoret of Cyrus appeared, a faithful friend of Nestorios and opponent of Cyril, yet "undeniably one of the greatest figures of that time" (Camelot), even a "kind of Augustine of the Orient" (Duchesne), the "fathers" from Egypt, Palestine and Illyria filled the church with deafening roar: "throw out the Jew, the adversary of God, and do not call him bishop." "He is a heretic! He is a Nestorian! Out with the heretic!" But even the "Augustine of the Orient," Bishop Theodoret, the enemy of Cyril, the friend of Nestorios, betrayed him after some reluctance. At first he declared: "First of all I assure you that I am not aiming at a bishopric...". For that, of course, was what Theodoret was after. And when he was threatened not to restitute him, to condemn him again, he stated for the record: "Let Nestorios be banished, and anyone who does not say that the holy Virgin is Theotokos; likewise anyone who splits the only son into two.... And after all, greetings!"¹⁵⁷

After all, hail!

Only, thirteen Egyptian bishops who had appeared with Dioskor sheered off. They pronounced Eutyches not guilty and adamantly refused to accept Leo's teaching letter; "we will be killed, we will be killed if we do." No urging helped, no threats. At the very least, they wanted postponement until the election of a new patriarch; indeed, they wanted to remain with the faith of their fathers and die on the spot rather than be stoned to death upon their return to Egypt – all with much pathos, with postponement finally granted by imperial officials until the Alexandrian see was filled anew, and with the bishops whining. But the "two-natu-ren" formula, as will soon be seen, actually led to wild excesses in Egypt and Palestine.¹⁵⁸

The 28th Canon 239

The 28th canon

27 canons had passed almost entirely happily for Rome (canons 9 and 17 aside, which had already expanded the rights of the Constantinople patriarch), when in the session of October 29 the last one, the "28th canon," brought the "great" Leo and the papacy, the dogmatic victor, a defeat of the worst kind in canon law and politics. This canon remained "the deepest reason of the coming discords ... to the present day" (Döl-ger).¹⁵⁹

The episcopal assembly thus apparently avenged itself for the dogma imposed on it by Rome through the emperor and codified the supremacy of the Patriarch of Constantinople in the East. Invoking Canon 3 of the Council of Constantinople (381) – which had granted "the honorary primacy" to the bishop there, though "after the bishop of Rome" – the Council of Chalcedon now recognized "the same prerogatives" to the Patriarch of New Rome (Constantinople) as the Patriarch of Old Rome had anyway to the right of ordination in the dioceses of Asia, Pontus and Thrace, and this according to a "long-established custom" (*consuetudinem, quae ex longo iam tempore permansit*). That is, the bishop of Constantinople was allowed to consecrate the metropolitan in these dioceses. Thus, he received not only an honorary primacy, but also jurisdiction over a large area in the Orient. Although the first right was certified to the old Rome, the same prerogatives were granted to the new Rome. The papal legates – apparently unprepared for the pope's discussion of constitutional issues – had deliberately, yet unwisely, avoided the decisive session, but protested most strongly against it at the next one. After the commissioners' request to present the canons, on which both parties relied, Paschasius quoted the 6th

canon of Nicaea, admittedly in the forged Roman version. In a Latin text that can be proved since 445, this canon bears the heading

240 The struggle for the bishop's chairs of the East

"De primatu ecclesiae Romanae" and asserts in the first sentence, "The Roman Church has always possessed primacy (primatum)." This, however, was an interpolation missing from the same canon of the Constantinople version. Legate Lucentius, bishop of Herculaneum, doubted the voluntary nature of the signatures, claimed a duping of the fathers, their rape, that they had been deceived, had signed under pressure. But a many-voiced, if not unanimous: "Nobody has been forced!" answered him. Individually, the chief shepherds testified that they had signed voluntarily and had no objections to the decision. The imperial directors recorded everything correctly, put it to the vote, and declared the 28th Canon adopted against the votes of the Roman delegation: "What has been presented has been approved by the whole Synod".

Leo I, of course, expressly agreed with the council's decisions insofar and only insofar as they concerned the faith, "in sola fidei causa." Otherwise, however, the Roman did not want what applied to Old Rome to apply also to New Rome, the new imperial city. After all, as he wrote to the emperor, confessing his "painful astonishment" that once again the spirit of ambition was disturbing the peace of the church that had just been established, different principles prevailed in divine matters than in secular ones, "alia ratio est rerum saecularium, alia divinarum". In fact, however, it was in accordance with the principle already precisely established at the Synod of Antioch (328 or 329) that the civil status of a place also determines its ecclesiastical rank. Towards the emperor, Leo still kept a measured distance. Towards others, St.

Pulcheria, Anatolius, Julian of Kios, he seethed. Himself brimming with imperiousness, the "Archbishop" of Rome, as the synodals apostrophized him after the conclusion of the Council, angrily disapproved of Constantinople's striving for supremacy as "unbridled covetousness", "immoderate excess of authority," "insolent presumption," "outrageous impudence," as an attempt, as he meant the Constantinople patriarch Anatolius, to whom he wrote probably most sharply, "to

The 28th Canon 241

most sacred canons to be torn down; it seemed to you that a favorable moment had presented itself, since the Alexandrian See had lost the privilege of the second rank, and the Antiochian Church had been deprived of its status as third in the order of honor, to deprive all the metropolitans of their honor after the submission of these places to your highness. "160

The Alexandrian "papacy" had destroyed Rome in league with the emperor. Now Leo obviously feared a "papacy" of Constantinople, the imperial capital, and all the more so because Rome was no longer the imperial capital even in the West, but Ravenna was. While Leo therefore celebrated the Council of Nicaea as a "divine privilege," he dressed down the "ecumenical" Council of Constantinople in 381 by pulling the Constantinople patriarch Anatolius "low for power" and railing against it, it was "of no use at all" to cite in his favor that "document" which "some bishops allegedly wrote sixty years ago," a paper which had never been brought to the attention of the Apostolic See by its predecessors. "To this document, which from the outset is decrepit and has long since sunk [!], you now, belatedly and in vain, wish to build a support by eliciting from the brethren (of the Synod of Chalcedon) a semblance of assent ..." And while the Greek Church in general held permanently to the 28th canon, Leo - in a letter to Empress Pulcheria - declared the bishops' assent "invalid" and cassamus it "by virtue of the authority of the blessed Apostle Peter by general definition altogether" (in irri-tum mittimus et per auctoritatem beati Petri apostoli, generali prorsus definitione cassamus).161

Even Jesuit Alois Grillmeier freely admits that the 28th canon "obviously attracted more" the papal gaze "than the dogmatic decision of the synod." Yes, he admits that Leo "paid less or no attention to the factual situation of the Eastern Churches. "162

Yet this pope acted outwardly quite caring, quite selfless. "I profess such love for the totality. 242 struggle for the episcopal sees of the Eastern friars," he wrote to his rival in Constantinople, "that I cannot grant to any one a request that is harmful to himself ..." And not only once did Leo I hide his colossal ambition behind such brotherly charity. For example, when he fought St. Hilarius in Gaul – once again one saint against the other (p. 250 ff) – he concluded a letter to the Gallic episcopate: "It is not we who champion for ourselves the ordinations in your provinces, as Hilarius perhaps [!] in his own way, in order to seduce your minds, but we preserve them for you by our care, so that henceforth no freedom may remain for innovation, nor opportunity for the presumptuous to destroy your privileges."¹⁶³

Who was this pope who, accusing other bishops, even saints, often justifiably, of presumption, himself, certainly unjustly, used presumptuous language like hardly any Roman hierarch before? Who seemed to preserve the prerogatives of other bishops by taking them away from them, and concealed this even by altruism?

PAPAL LEO I.

(440–461)

"...a leader personality". Daniel Rops'

"... until Leo I there was not on the See of Peter even one bishop of historical importance and greatness". Ferdinand Gregorovius*

"He roared, and the cowardly hearts of the beasts began to tremble". Epitaph set by Pope Sergius 1,688 for Leo I?

"Playing with his name, he has been praised to our days as the Lion of the Tribe of Judah, a flattery he does not deserve. One might rather compare him to the fox".

John Haller*

"Leo is the first ancient Christian pope of whom we know that he possessed a clear and definite papal idea It proceeded from the fact that the Roman bishop is the successor of the apostle Peter. From this Leo drew the conclusion that he possessed the same authority that Christ conferred on the apostle."

Catholic theologian Albert Ehrhard*.

"This doctrine of primacy ... Leo the Great delivered so exquisitely that it has remained the backbone of the papacy to this day." Walter Ullmann*

Nothing is known about Leo I's homeland, his parents, his course of study. "The best that can be suggested cannot be more than a guess" (Jalland). Older Catholic authors like to let him come from very distinguished circles – "heretics" are said to have rather "low" origins in uncertain cases. Leo was probably born towards the end of the 4th century, and most manuscripts of the "Liber Pontificalis" call him a native of Tuscany. Volterra, in particular, claims to be his birthplace. As late as 1543, it fined anyone there who did not celebrate Leo's memorial day, April 11, with a fine of 48 solidi!⁷

Tiro Prosper of Aquitaine, curial under Leo, however, calls Rome his home, and he himself calls Rome "my fatherland", which may have further meaning. It is only certain that Leo was already deacon of the "Apostolic See" under his predecessors Coelestine I and Sixtus III and already had great influence. Even Cyril of Alexandria made efforts to get him. And the regent of the West, Galla Placidia, sent him to Gaul in the summer of 440 to settle the enmity between the commander Aetius and the governor Albinus. During this mission, the archdeacon Leo was elected pope and consecrated upon his return on Sept. 2, 440.⁸

Leo I PREDICTED HIS PREVIOUSNESS 245

Leo I. PREDICTS HIS PREVIOUSNESS –and humility to the laity

This pope became historically significant for his expansion of the Roman primacy. With little support

from tradition – with the exception of his last predecessors – but all the more self-evident, systematic and consistent, he consolidated and expanded the papal claims to power.

For their justification, their propagation, he used above all the doctrine of Peter. This doctrine had already been talked up to the entire Occident, including Africa. Leo, however, stressed it especially often and increased it to the papal full power (*pleni-tudo potestas*), to the "Petrinology", not without combining it with elements of the pagan Rome and empire ideology and a corresponding "court ceremonial". Incessantly Leo speaks of Peter. Again and again he puts him completely in the center. Then he equates the Roman bishops with Peter. He makes them "partakers" of Peter's honor, further, his "heirs." The term "Vicar" of Peter also appears around this time. And with the concept of the "deputy", the "heir", Leo identifies himself with Peter also juridically, claiming all his supposed powers. Through all kinds of bold exegetical arts, he assimilates Peter, "the trumpet of the apostles", to Jesus as well, he lets him participate in the power of God, in order to let the pope participate in it again. Everything is there "in unchanging participation". Because through the mouth of the pope Peter speaks. He who hears the Pope hears Peter, hears Christ, hears God! "Therefore, when we lower our exhortations into your holiness' ears, believe that he himself, as whose representative we officiate (*cuius vice fungimur*), speaks."

If in Cyprian Peter had a primacy only *inter pares*, Leo now elevates Peter high above all. Again and again he invokes Peter's primacy, the claim of the popes to leadership, Rome as the chair of chairs – the *sedes apostolica*, the head of the church, bending the tradition in the process, increasing it, also raising completely new claims, even making use of Valentinian's and the

246 Pope Leo 1.

He even makes use of Valentinian and the ladies of the imperial house, whom he has write letters to Constantinople (p. 226 f), which go beyond everything that had been established so far about the Roman primacy. The bishop of Rome alone and no one else is "Vicar of Peter," a phrase probably first created by Leo (but perhaps as early as 431 by the legate Philip in Ephesus); Peter, "in whose stead We reign" – the first *pluralis majestatis* in papal history. Thus, the Roman bishop is "not only bishop of this see, but primate of all bishops." All owe him obedience, including all *maiores ecclesiae*, all patriarchates. He is called "to govern the whole Church," to be "prince of the whole Church," "of all the Churches of the whole world." Only "an antichrist or the devil" would deny this. And whoever denied him the supreme power (*principatum*) could not diminish his dignity "in any way, but, inflated by the spirit of arrogance, plunges himself into hell." Who is inflated here is clear – even if Leo still so often emphasizes his lowliness, unworthiness, his incapacity, in short, the "*indignus haeres*". This man, who was washed in all the waters of Roman jurisprudence, who also created a close legal connection between pope and Peter through the concepts of partnership and heir, an indivisible unity of theology and law, Bible and jurisprudence, nevertheless already coined the notorious formulation – there was reason enough long ago and soon more and more – that Peter's "dignity is not lacking even in the unworthy heir" (*etiam in indigno haerede*). But in this way, comments Catholic Kühner, "everything, up to the crime, could finally be justified".⁹

Pope Leo never tired of emphasizing the (omnipotence) of the popes and thus of himself. Again and again he wrote, preached of it. "In the whole world only Peter was chosen to be the head of all the apostles, of all the called peoples, of all the fathers of the Church." "From all over the world people take refuge in the chair of St. Peter". He is praised by Leo as "rock" and foundation, "gatekeeper of the kingdom of heaven," "arbiter of the reservation and indulgence of sins." To be sure

Leo I PREDICTS HIS PRIORITY Z47 all bishops, he admits, have a "common dignity," but by no means "equal rank." Similarly, he says, it was already the case with Peter, with the apostles – "and although all were chosen in the same way, yet only one was given to excel the rest." Yes, Leo not only

goes so far as to assert that Peter's judgment "has validity in heaven also," but that he, the pope, in the exercise of his office, enjoys "the everlasting favor of the almighty and eternal High Priest," who is "like him [!] and equal to the Father." ¹⁰

The presumption can hardly be pushed any higher. But Leo had already in his first papal sermon, on September 29, 440, the oldest handed down sermon of a pope, not exactly modestly exulted with the psalmist: "He has blessed me, since he has done great wonders for me...". Or, soon after, exulted that God had made him "honorable", had brought him up to the "highest level". ¹¹

But to the sheep he preached all the more insistently humility! "For the whole victory of the Savior, who conquered Satan and the world, had its beginning and its end in humility." (Leo often and elaborately invokes devil and hell, much less often, as usual, heaven; it gives less away now). Yes, Leo asserts, "So then, beloved, the whole [!] doctrine of Christian wisdom consists not in prolix words and sophistical discussions, nor in the pursuit of glory and honor"-that was only for his equals-"but in true and voluntary humility"-that was for the subjects, the dependent, the exploited: remembering only that as early as the 5th century the Roman bishop had been the greatest landlord in the whole Roman Empire. ¹²

248 Pope Leo 1.

Who was this Leo?

He left behind a larger body of writings than any pope before, 90 sermons, feast sermons, Lenten sermons, Passion sermons. (Neither from his predecessors nor from his immediate successors are sermons handed down). Furthermore, we have almost twice as many letters from him (114 of which concern his Ostpolitik). But from sermons, "beloved", it is not so easy to deduce a character. Also, Leo's sermons were consistently short, some (1,6,7,8,13, 80) extremely short, as if he had emulated the example of Flavius Cyrus (p. 155). And his 173 letters (among them about 20 fake ones as well as 30 addressed to him) are, moreover, probably mainly products of the chancery, above all of Prosper of Aquitaine, a zealous theologizing South Gaulish author, friend of Augustine and fierce Pelagian fighter. From Prosper, in particular, comes "quite certainly" also the theological content of those "great state writings that made Leo's name famous in West and East," as Johannes Haller writes, previously emphasizing: "At least the artificial form that was so dear to this period of decay, the sounding pathos that says so little with many big words, the rhythmic tone that captivates the ear with its euphony and deceives about the poverty and weakness of the thoughts, they can just as well belong to the servant as to the master". ¹³

In any case, Leo, who appeared so autocratic, already fond of "apostolic" (!) court ceremonial, who so pompously propagated Roman primacy and called the "chair of Peter" an "object of trembling" (materia trepidationis), was a typical "lord," a spiritual master, whom in 865 one of his most remarkable successors, Nicholas I, in a letter to Emperor Michael, compared to the "lion of the tribe of Judah" (Apk. 5,5), who "opened his mouth and shook the whole world, even the emperors themselves".

However exaggerated this was and how cleverly, not to say hypocritically, he often embellished his lust for power, his constant rigorous demands for obedience, with biblical sayings, for instance by calling himself the "disciple

Who was this Leo? "149 of a humble and meek master, "who says, <Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am kind and lowly in heart....

my yoke is not oppressive, and my burden is light"" - in reality Leo was a brusque unevangelical nature. In a letter of October 10, 443, to the bishops of Campania, Picenum, Tuscia, it agitates him that "everywhere" (passim) slaves are ordained presbyters, and he firmly forbids the appointment of clergy who "no proper birth" recommends. Once Christianity had consisted largely of such circles! Now the pope forbids the elevation of a "shabby slave" (servilis vilitas) to the priesthood, since even before God he is not tried who could not even try himself with his master. Leo I, the Doctor of the Church, "the

Great", thus makes the dignity of birth a prerequisite for the spiritual career. He condemns the ordination of slaves as a violation of the sanctity of the priestly office and the rights of masters! Thus the church adapted itself to the late Roman slave-owning society, which it itself represented like hardly anyone else. The Christian state gladly took note of this. Only a few years later – the connection is tangible – Valentinian III decreed a ban on ordination for slaves, colonists and members of the forced corporations!¹⁴

Leo I is also lofty toward his fellow bishops. He commands. He must command. For one surpasses all. Thus he makes them feel that he is more, that he is superior to them, that he stands "on high ground according to the will of the Lord". He also commands prelates who are so far independent of Rome, like the Metropolitan of Aquileia; yes, he threatens him. He also commands the Spanish bishops. The Gallican episcopes no longer call him "your brotherhood" as before, but "your apostolate" (*apostolatus vester*). They also apostrophize him "*corona vestra*". In addition, the plural is now used in the form of address.¹⁻¹

Leo proceeded accordingly against his colleagues; for example, in Gaul, where the bishops of Arles and Vienne fought over the dignity of metropolitan; we will merely touch on the prehistory.

zjo Pope Leo I.

St. Leo against St. Hilarius

In the early 5th century, Heros occupied the episcopal see of Arles, "Gallic Rome" (*gallula Roma*), then one of the leading cities of the West. Heros, a disciple of St. Martin of Tours, had, according to Zosimus' testimony, forced his episcopate by threat and violence and was able to maintain his see only with the help of the usurper Constantine III, who resided in Arles from 409 to 411. Thus, it is quite credible that Heros, as historian Sozomenos writes, gave shelter to the locked-up usurper in his church and even ordained him priest, without, of course, being able to prevent his execution (p. 28). Soon after, Heros, together with the heavily incriminated Bishop Lazarus of Aix, found themselves in Palestinian exile as a result of their political and other machinations, where they agitated against Pelagius, whom they also formally sued by means of an extensive writing (1496).¹⁶

A successor of Heros, the influential, later murdered Patroclus of Arles (412-426), likewise "Un personnage assez suspect" (Duchesne), had then, covered by the government of his friend Flavius Constantine (p. 45), who himself had brought him to the episcopal throne, enforced the elevation of Pope Zosimus. And immediately Zosimus (1497 ff) endowed Bishop Patroclus with "a series of striking privileges" (Catholic Baus), establishing already by his first decree of March 22, 417 –four days after his accession! – for Patroclus "an extensive metropolitan power", yes, he furthermore granted him the right of superintendence "over the entire Gallic church" (Catholic Langgärtner) – possibly a kind of prompt receipt for the pope's electoral assistance.¹⁷

Bishop Patroclus had also promoted this development "ecclesiastically" by obtaining a Petrine foundation for his see. Part of the irony of history is that Rome itself, namely Pope Innocent I, spread the lie that all the churches of the world had been founded by Peter or his disciples (p. 125 f). Rome's primacy benefited from this, but it brought the popes into conflict with other conflict with other power-hungry clerics. Thus, Bishop Patroclus of Arles invented a disciple of Peter, St. Trophimus of Arles, elevated him, who had never lived, to missionary of Gaul and founder of the Arelate Church, and thus, with Pope Zosimus' assistance, to metropolitan. The bishops of Marseilles, Nar-bonne, Vienne immediately protested and, despite summonses and sharp rejections, refused to obey Rome. Proculus of Marseilles was deposed. And a few decades later, this led to a serious falling out between Pope Leo I and a successor of Patroclus, St. Hilarius of Arles, from whom Leo took back the metropolitan rights already restricted by his predecessors.¹⁸

Archbishop Hilarius of Arles (429-449), a true saint of the Catholic Church (feast: May 5), came from

old political leadership circles. Initially a monk of the island monastery of Lerinum (Lerins), he had come to episcopal honors himself through a relative, his predecessor Bishop Honoratus – however much he resisted, if one may believe his biographer; who also reports that St. Hilarius was always, even in winter, a bishop. He also reports that St. Hilarius always went barefoot on his many journeys, even in winter, and always wore only a single, miserable dress and an embarrassing penitential shirt underneath, that he ransomed prisoners, founded monasteries, built churches, often preached for up to three hours in a row on fast days, and also wept bitterly when a misfortune struck one of his own. On the other hand, St. Hilarius, according to St. Leo, marched by force of arms tumultuously into cities whose bishops had died, in order to impose on them a successor from among his followers. Even while the bishop Projectus was seriously prostrate, the saint appeared and consecrated a new head of the church, Importunus. "For his insolence, the death of his brother did not seem to come quickly enough," the pope sneered.

Contrary to expectations, Projectus recovered, and the citizens of the city complained about Hilarius: "He was gone again before we even knew he had come." The metropolitan was also quick to issue excommunications. Such things set St. Leo against St. Hilarius, who "had his

251 Pope Leo I fame more in scurrilous speed than in measured priestly bearing." One saint stood here against the other, which is not altogether uncommon, occurring even in two church teachers (1174 ff)* And as in non-saintly circles, so in saintly ones the superior stabs the inferior.¹

The Roman feared the grasping, eloquent colleague, the forming patriarchate of Arles, yes, an independent Gallic church, especially since the Gallic aristocracy, related to Hilarius, was also behind him and against the nobility of Italy. Thus, when Hilarius clashed with Projectus and the bishop Chelidonius, whom Hilarius deposed because he was said to have been married to a widow, Leo proceeded to a frontal attack. "He desires to subject (subdere) you to his authority," wrote Leo to the episcopi of the province of Vienne, "and will not himself suffer to be subject (subiectum) to St. Peter," "and violates the reverence of St. Peter with most insolent words..." St. Leo accuses St. Hilarius of "ambition for new pretensions." He claims "that he indulges his desires," that he "believes himself to be subject to no law, to be unrestrained by any rules of divine order," that he commits "illicit things" and disregards "what he ought to observe" When the Arelate sought to discuss the matter amicably with Leo in 445, after crossing the Alps on foot in the middle of winter – "fearlessly he entered Rome, without horse, nor saddle, nor cloak" (Vita Hilarii) – Leo, however, placed him under guard and before a council. Hilarius, however, hurled angry invectives into the assembly, "which no layman may utter, no bishop may hear" (quae nullus laicorum dicere, nullus sacerdotum posset audire), and departed again. The domineering archbishop, whose asceticism was admired in Gaul, who was also popular with most of his colleagues, and whose ambitions were initially unquestioned, now fell victim to the even more domineering Leo. Only the right to his own diocese, which he actually also forfeited, the Roman left to him who "by ignominious flight" evaded and "in an evil way claimed the power".

St. Leo against St. Hilarius 253

After all, Leo had not deposed the popular Hilarius (as a late Viennese forgery then claims). But in order to give emphasis to his measures, he assured himself – already usual with him – of the authority of the state. Informed "by faithful report of the venerable Roman bishop Leo" of the "ab-ominabilis tumultus" in Gaul's churches, on July 8, 445, Emperor Valentinian III ordered obedience "for all time" to his orders as well as to the authority of the Apostolic See, under penalty of ten pounds of gold, and commanded provincial governors to bring recalcitrant bishops by force before the tribunal of the Roman bishop – "preserving all the rights which our ancestors conferred on the Roman Church." ²⁰

Leo I particularly emphasized the duty of protection of the sovereign, who often acted as "custos fidei" with him, and declared it to be virtually an essential characteristic of imperial power. The monarch has his power from God, thus not merely for the government of the world, "but above all (maxime) for the

protection of the Church" – this will always be for the popes by far the most important task of state power! And this is always connected, if at all possible, with the destruction or at least the suppression of those of other faiths.²¹

Leo now ruled the bishops of Gaul, but only in the southern part of the country, where for the time being, through Aetius, the emperor also still ruled; but disaster was approaching there as well.

Hilarius, however, caught a serious illness during his winter march back over the Alps, to which he succumbed

in 449. All Arles was said to be in mourning, wanting to touch his holy body, so that the corpse was in danger of being torn to pieces. And Leo now commemorated the dead man as "sanctae memoriae".

z\$4 Pope Leo I.

Pope Leo grants infallibility in faith to the emperor and to himself the duty,

TO PROCLAIM THE IMPERIAL FAITH.

However, the pope knew how to behave in a significant way even towards higher people. When the Emperor Valentinian III, a weak man who gave gifts to the Church and was very much under the influence of Leo's doctrine of Peter, visited Rome in February 450, Leo apostrophized him in a sermon with that typical clerical pseudo-demeanor that in truth bristles with arrogance and imperiousness:

"Behold, a poor little man like Peter has been given by Christ the first and greatest city in the world to govern. To the wood of the cross the scepters of kings have submitted; the purple of the court is subservient to the blood of Christ and the martyrs. The emperor ... Comes and desires the intercession of the fisherman."

The spiritual empire of the pope now appears on an equal footing with the imperial one, but "the germ of superiority is already present" (Klinkenberg).²²

If it seemed appropriate, even the "great" Leo could hump upwards, especially when the potentates fought heretics and pagans – an activity he demanded and liked to call "labor" (effort, work); he also called his own work that way. Yes, if it was opportune, he celebrated the emperors – who just at that time (so far hardly noticed) dubbed themselves "pontiff" – as "guardians of the faith", "sons of the church", "heralds of Christ". He then recognized them the most amazing rights also in the ecclesiastical sector, authority in the religious field, "priestly sanctity". More than fifteen times there are commendations in Leo about the royal and priestly (episcopal) disposition of the prince.²³

"I know," writes Pope Leo I to Emperor Leo I, "that you are sufficiently instructed by the Spirit of God dwelling in you." He certifies to the ruler "that our doctrine also agrees with the faith given to you by God."

Pope Leo grants the emperor infallibility in the faith Z55

with which he even grants him a doctrinal inspiration. He even certifies him the right to overrule decisions of councils concerning dogmas. And he increases all these concessions in several letters up to the concession of infallibility! Leo I, called the Great (and as the only pope, besides Gregory I, the likewise "great" one, honored with the rare title of a church teacher), deigned so far as to repeatedly affirm in letters to the emperor that he needed no human instruction, was enlightened by the Holy Spirit and could not err in faith! Pope Leo emphatically assures that the Emperor Leo "filled with the purest light of truth" does not waver in any part of the faith, "but with holy and perfect judgment distinguishes the right from the evil"; "that you are sufficiently instructed by the indwelling Spirit of God and that no error can reflect anything to your faith"; "that your mildness has no need of human instruction and has drawn the purest teaching from the abundance of the Holy Spirit". Yes, he confesses that it is his, the pope's, "duty" to "reveal what you know and proclaim what you believe" (*patefacere quod intelligis, et praedicare quod credis*) – and all this although the pope is not at all convinced of the emperor's infallibility!²⁴

(Interestingly, not a few bishops, for example those of secunda Syria, even more those of prima Armenia, even applied the Peter promise of Mt. 16:18: You are Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, to Leo, yet not to Leo the pope, but to Leo the emperor! For them, Christ was, of course, the "head" of the holy Catholic Church –their "strength and foundation, however," wrote the bishops, is you, the emperor, namely, "in imitation of the immovable rock of Christ, on which the Creator of the universe built his Church. "25

z\$6 Pope Leo I.

In favor: "Doing war service under Christ ..."

On the other hand Leo emphasizes without end that less the emperor rules than Christ and God. That the emperor has his power from the Most High – "regnat per Dei gratiam". He instructed Julian of Kios to pass on "the right suggestions" (*opportunas suggestiones*) to the monarch at the right time. He, Leo, knew from "much experience" the faith of the glorious Augustus and knew that he "is convinced that he will serve his rule best when he is particularly concerned to work for the integrity of the Church". For the emperor had received his power primarily for the protection of the Church, as Leo I insists, very often calling the emperor "*custos fidei*." And the benefit of the Church, he suggests, is also the benefit of the State. "It is to the advantage of the whole Church and of your kingdom if one God, one faith, one mystery of man's salvation, and one confession are maintained throughout the world." Not enough, this Vicar of Christ also already entices with how much the religion of love benefits the war, the Good News of the striking power of the army. "When the Spirit of God strengthens the concord between the Christian princes," that is here the emperors Marcian and Valentinian, "then the whole world sees how in two respects confidence grows: for through progress in faith and love [!] the power of arms [!] becomes insurmountable, so that God, graced by the unity of our faith, will at the same time destroy the error of false doctrine and the hostility of the barbarians. "26

Clear language! Love and weapons! Unity, strength, destruction of enemies – admittedly long since the program and practice of Christianity (I. ch. 5), especially in Rome, where, for example, presumably in the early 5th century, the Christian Aponius not only zealously proclaims the ecclesiastical supremacy of the Eternal City, but also a Christian imperial theology. According to this, the head of the people are the Roman kings, "those, to be sure, who have the true–

Collaboration for the destruction of the "heretics" 157 and serve Christ in humility [!]. From them flow the pious laws, the praiseworthy peace and the sublime submissiveness [!] to the cult of the holy church as from the Carmel river ..." But in order that all this, the pious legislation, the praiseworthy peace, the submissiveness, may flow and flow beautifully, the kings must "do war service under Christ the King of kings . ".27

Leo understood it in exactly the same way, propagating for the whole world one God, one empire, one emperor–(One God, one empire, one leader...!)-and one Church, of course, which he passed off as a "sacred order," as a "*pax christiana*," endangered by "only" two enemies: "heretics" and "barbarians." "Therefore also the emperor must fight against both" (Grillmeier SJ). Therefore he is obliged to the "*reparatio pacis*", to what they understand by it, hide under it: war, until they have what they want (cf. 144 f, 364), without regard for losses. That is how, and not otherwise, they would like it to be even today. Seventeen centuries of church history illustrate this. Bloodier than anywhere else. And more disastrously...

Collaboration for the destruction of the "heretics" under "emphasis of the human dignity".

For "heretics" such a pope knows no pardon. Again and again he incites against the "heresies of the beleaguering heretics," their "pointed arrows," "poisonous lies," "impious beliefs," "monstrosities." They are all, Leo teaches, "seduced by the devil's guile," "corrupted by the devil's wickedness," susceptible to "all manner of vices," inclined to "ever more grievous sins." Sometimes they appear humble, flattering,

"in sheep's clothing, but inside they are ravening wolves" who only cover "their wild predatory nature with the name of Christ". The devil leads them, and do these animals, the whole "packs of these beasts of prey", as said, go easy on them,

258 Pope Leo 1 cunningly, with friendly participation, at last, however, they "finally resort to murder".²⁹

Basically: the description of one's own practice. A classic self-portrait.

As pastoral-theological prophylaxis, Pope Leo recommends over and over again – it is closely related – fasting, mortification of the flesh, contempt of the world, especially, of course, that applies to this whole "morality" until the 20th century, contempt of lust. "Voluptuousness" leads, according to Leo, "to the places of death." In reality, however, it is the other way around. Leads just drive renunciation to the aggression, the lust murder to the murder lust. How then Christianity – in addition Nietzsche – turns almost everything upside down! Therefore, according to Leo "the Great", the Christian has also "to fight constantly with his flesh", he has to "withdraw every breeding ground from the lusts of the flesh", he has to "kill his desires, die to his vices", in general "avoid all earthly lust". For Leo, "all worldly love is excluded." Literally he teaches: "you must despise earthly things in order to share in the kingdom of heaven".³⁰

All this is as clear as daylight for Leo L, the pope, the saint, the Doctor of the Church. Whoever thinks otherwise lives "in filth." For for whom else, he asks, "do the desires of the flesh fight but for the devil....",³¹

The "great" Leo really teaches that "outside the Catholic Church there is nothing pure and holy"! And this still with reference to Paul (Rom. 14,23). That is why the Pope also forbids "all intercourse" with non-Catholics! He expressly calls for their contempt, for their teachings. He orders to flee them "like deadly poison! Abhor them, avoid them, and avoid speaking with them." "No communion with those who are enemies of the Catholic faith and Christians in name only!" They must all "return to their dark hiding places!"³²

From discussions of faith,

religious disputations, as probably every pope, a fortiori one for whom non-Catholics are little other than devils, "wolves and robbers," refrained from

collaboration for the destruction of the "heretics" ^{2.59} from the outset. All this was decided, and if anything remained to be decided, he decided. He unhesitatingly declared to the Council Fathers of Chalcedon that they could not be in doubt as to what he wished "to be believed...". And after the council he urged the emperor not to allow any new negotiations. That would be ingratitude to God.

"What has been defined in all form (pie et plene) must not be discussed anew, otherwise, as the damned would have it, we give the impression of doubting ourselves ..." "Questions of doubt" were no longer to be examined according to Leo, but he, Leo, had only to set forth the correct decisions "with the highest authority." "Indeed, if human convictions are always free to debate (disceptare), there will never be a lack of people who dare to contradict the truth and trust in the garrulity of worldly prudence." In contrast, "it is enough for the true faith to know who teaches" (scire quis doceat).³³

But whoever taught differently than Leo, against him he used the state according to a custom that had already been practiced for a long time, but which he intensified. Much like Nestorios (p. 157), Pope Leo appealed to the rulers of the East: "If you defend the secure existence of the Church against all false doctrine, then Christ's strong hand will also defend your empire. In the West, Christ's strong hand had to deal with "a bigoted woman" and "a weak-minded emperor" (Gregorovius): with Augusta Galla Placidia, who was very close to the church and who for a long time led the affairs of state for her no less good Catholic son Valentinian III, but beyond that was probably involved in important political decisions until her death on November 27, 450. (One of her longtime advisors: St. Barbatianus, a priest

who worked many "miracles" first in Rome, then in Ravenna.)³⁴

Certainly the government also had an interest in promoting the centralizing tendency of the Roman Church, if only because the tottering empire itself hoped to profit from it in the provinces that Germanic tribes occupied or threatened. Such considerations–

260 Pope Leo I.

considerations just made Leo's successes in the West possible. Throughout the 4th and 5th centuries, the state's policy toward the church intended, on the one hand, its unity and pacification, but on the other hand, it resisted the autocracy of a single episcopal see. Thus, it is true that the state overcame Alexandria in alliance with Rome at the Council of Chalcedon. But the attempt to keep Rome in check through the Patriarch of Constantinople failed. The state was weak, and the pope used this weakness for his own purposes, understandably always being well-adjusted, never rebellious.³⁵

Leo I maintained the best relations with the princes. A large part of his extant correspondence–144 letters–is addressed to the imperial house. Catholic Camelot praises "a trusting and harmonious collaboration." Jesuit Hugo Rahner speaks of "Leo's imperial devotion." And even in his earliest epistles, the pope vehemently rails against the "heretics": nothing but a seceding, partisan, rebellious multitude, full of perversity, depravity, deceitfulness, and impiety, full of perfidy and folly; their doctrine one bad pestilential delusion: error, pravus error, totius erroris pravi-tas, pestiferus error, haereticus error.³⁶ The initiative in this anti-Heretical cooperation, the struggle of the "children of light" against the "children of darkness," obviously came from the pope. He sent letters of praise and thanks to their majesties for the punishment of his opponents. He knew that without the support of state power the "heresy", especially in the East, would become overwhelming. Therefore, he expressly and repeatedly called upon Valentinian III, Marcian, Leo I, the Empress Pulcheria, a passionate supporter of the idea of the Pope, to fight heretics, to act "pro fide". He wanted the expulsion of dissenters from office and dignities, especially wanted their banishment, but also passionately justified the death penalty for them, demanded to make it impossible for them "to continue living with such a confession". The pestilence of heresy is for the pope "sickness" that "must be cut out of the body".

collaboration to destroy the "heretics" "261 of the Church" (haereses a corpore ecclesiae resecantur). The emperor, who has to persecute "heretics" both with "the sword of the tongue" and by virtue of the "naked sword", appears with Leo virtually as "Vicarius Christi vel Dei", as "extended arm of God". The Catholic theologian Stockmeier commented on this obvious bloodthirstiness as late as 1959: "The state is called upon to cooperate with all its means and possibilities in the completion of the ideal state [!]." "Under the protecting hand of the emperor religion goes with the rich abundance of its values [!] and goods and also finds refuge there. Gratefully it looks up to him. , "37

To his agent, Bishop Julian of Kios (in Bithynia Pontica), probably the first apocrisiarch at the imperial court in Constantinople, Leo I wrote that if people "have stooped to madness, so that they would rather rage than be cured, it is a matter for imperial authority that the disturbers of ecclesiastical peace, like the enemies of the state, which rightly boasts of its Christian rulers, should be more vigorously suppressed." "then at least," as he tells his envoy in another letter, "they should fear the power of the penal powers."

38

To the patriarch Anatolius of Constantinople, whose ambitions he himself jealously resents and denounces to the emperor, he declares on n. October 457 his "strongest displeasure that among your clergy there should be some who incline to the malice of the adversaries.... Your care must be vigilant to ferret them out (investigandis) and punish them with due severity (severitate congrua); those to whom punishment can be of no avail are to be cut off without sparing. "3'

And since Anatolius was not harsh enough for him, he wrote to Emperor Leo in 457 that if his brother Anatolius showed himself lax in suppressing "heretical" clerics "by too great kindness and gentleness,

you deign for the sake of your faith also to administer to the Church the remedy that such be expelled not only from the ordo of the clergy, but also from the city of

z6i Pope Leo I.

be banished." "For the episcopal and apostolic sense of your piety, to just punishment shall also inflame the evil. "40

To Gennadius, the exarch of Africa, the pope wrote that Gennadius must now turn with the same strength as against the external enemies also against the enemies of the Church, "fight for the Christian people as warriors of the Lord the battles of the Church." It was known that the "heretics", if they were given freedom, "would rise up impetuously against the Catholic faith in order to instill the poison of heresy into the members of the body of Christ". After all, he had already thanked Emperor Marcian for the fact that "by God's providence, heresy was destroyed through you" (*destructa est*).⁴¹

This was no doubt what Pope Pelagius praised as Leo's "life-giving concern for the faith." That was certainly what Emperor Valentinian publicly praised as the "humanity of mild Leo" on July 17, 445. And that, too, was apparently what a modern panegyric, Jesuit Hugo Rahner, repeatedly praises as Leo's "moderatio" – "in the comprehensive and untranslatable sense of that genuinely Roman and Christian word which Leo loved so much.... Moderatio is the fine sense of distributive justice, of noble moderation, of the balanced middle ground between extremes, the prudent, often downright diplomatic estimation of what is possible in each case, which, for all its elegance of yielding, holds unswervingly to the goal. . ." In short, Leo, according to the Catholic theologian Fuchs as late as the second half of the twentieth century, is about "the emphasis on human dignity"–as was still the case with John Paul II (cf. my pamphlet "A Pope Travels to the Scene of the Crime").⁴²

In reality, Leo was relentless in the "heretic" struggle even as a deacon.

Leo I as Persecutor 163

Leo I as persecutor of Pelagians, Manichaeans, Priscillianists, and as preacher of love of enemies.

Leo already intervened decisively in the ruination of Augustine's great opponent Julian of Aelclanum (1501 ff). According to a report by Prosper, it was due to Leo the deacon that Sixtus III denied the hounded Julian reinstatement in his bishopric in 439. As Leo later condemned him again. (After all, he also pressured Emperor Marcian to put the already exiled Eutyches in an even more remote location.)⁴³ Leo's first attack as pope was on the Pelagians (1492 ff) in Veneto in 442. Bishop Septimus of Altinum had denounced to him that clerics of Pelagius and Caelestius had been received into the Church without recantation in the see of the Archbishop of Aquileia. Leo praised the suffragan, but sharply rebuked the metropolitan that "wolves in sheep's clothing" had entered the flock of the Lord through the laxity of the shepherds, threatened him with severe apostolic wrath for further laxity, urged the condemnation of "error," "arrogant heresy," "grave disease" (*pestilentiam*), and the "eradication of this heresy. "44

Almost like an inquisitor, the pope hunted the Manichaeans since 443.

If he found, he wrote at that time, "something true in any part of all heresies," then in the dogma of the Manichaeans "not even the slightest thing" that could be tolerated at all. Everything was bad with them. Mani himself a "deceiver of the unfortunate," a servant of "lewd superstition," his doctrine "virtually a stronghold" of the devil, who here commanded "unrestrictedly not

only over a kind of depravity," "but over all imaginable folly and nefariousness taken together. All the depravity of the heathen, all the obduracy of the "carnally minded Jews, all the forbidden things in the secret doctrines of magic, all the sacrileges and blasphemies in all the heresies, all these were found in this sect like

Z64 Pope Leo 1.

accumulated in a kind of cesspool at the same time with all other refuse". Leo affirms that "nothing is sacred with them, nothing is pure, nothing is true", "everything is shrouded in darkness and everything

is deceptive". Yes, he claims that the "number of their crimes" is "greater than the quantity of words available for them." ⁴⁵

Exaggerations, generalizations, absolutizations that speak for themselves.

Manichaeism (cf. I 166 ff), which, against the background of a transcendental monism, rigorously dualistically divides the world of appearances, was, with its Buddhist, Iranian, Babylonian, late Jewish and Christian elements, a syncretic universalism, a world religion that stretched from Spain to China. Usually harshly rejected because of its claim to exclusivity, it was the state religion only in the Uighur (Old Turkic) Empire in Mongolia from 763 to 814. Christian emperors have persecuted the cult, which Diocletian already fought against by law, as the most dangerous of all "heresies". Already the Catholic Theodosius I, who also otherwise shed blood like water, threatened the affiliation to Manichaeism with the death penalty, after a long series of church fathers had written against it and wrote, especially successfully Ephräm (cf. I 166 f) and Augustin (I 467), himself a Manichaean for almost ten years.⁴⁶ Since the conquest of Carthage by the Vandals (439), many Manichaeans fled to Italy, especially Rome, with the multitudes of African refugees. Frequently and passionately Leo attacked them there, scolding them a "devouring cancer", a "cesspool", and had them tracked down, arrested, probably tortured, in his "care" (Grisar SJ). He had also imprisoned (a nobis tentus) the Mani-Chaeian bishop and made him confess. By a tribunal of Christian senators, bishops, priests, which he himself presided, he had a number of Electi and Electae interrogated in detail in December 443 (of "chosen ones" who do not kill anything living, do not damage plants, do not have sexual intercourse

Leo I as persecutor 265

while the auditores, the "hearers," could marry). The Pope revealed their "ignominies", including ritual "fornication" with a very young girl for the liberation of the divine particles of light in the semen humanum. For St. Leo as well as St. Augustine ("non sacramentum, sed execramentum") put the finger "on Manichean lechery as such" (Grillmeier SJ). Leo had the writings of the accused demanded and publicly burned. Some, who were still to be "reformed", had to renounce, were taken in church punishment and snatched "from the maw of godlessness". Others, however, whom "no remedy" could save, were sentenced by "secular" judges to life-long (!) banishment ("per publicos iudices perpetuo sunt exsilio relegati") "according to the decrees of the Christian emperors". He had also investigated the personal data of foreign Manichaeans during interrogation, had his victims forced to testify about their teachers, bishops, priests in other provinces and cities, and furthermore had ordered all prelates of Italy on January 30, 444, to track down and seize escaped Manichaeans; whereby he enclosed the Roman trial records for instruction, for emulation and emulation, yes, finally, he extended his hunt for "heretics" by means of hidebound letters as far as the Orient.⁴⁷

Not enough. He even incited the laity to denounce, snoop, brag, a business that was then to flourish so beneficially in the medieval church, in the destruction of dissenters, of "witches." "Develop, then, the holy zeal which the care of religion demands of you!" he cried, commanding "the defense of all believers"; commanding "that you bring to the notice of your priests the Manichaeans who are hiding everywhere"; demanding "to uncover the hiding-places of the impious and to fight down in them the very one whom they serve, i.e. the devil. Even if, beloved, the whole world and the whole Church should take up arms of faith against such people, you in particular must distinguish yourselves in this work by being active....", ⁴⁸

The same Leo, however, who acted almost like a medieval inquisitor, was able to drone on and on with his Christian slogans, demanding forbearance, peaceableness, charity, avoidance of quarrelsomeness, renunciation of revenge. Again and again he could preach hypocritically: "And because everyone transgresses, let everyone also forgive! Let us not unwillingly grant what we so gladly put up with!" "Eliminate all enmity among men by peaceableness, "not repaying evil for evil "and forgiving one

another, as Christ also forgave us!>" "Let all revenge cease ..." "Away, then, with all threats!" "Let cruel severity be turned into gentleness, and irascibility into meekness! May all forgive one another their trespasses!" "Let us pray, "Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors! > " The Pope emphasizes explicitly: "This does not only mean those who are close to us through friendship or kinship, but virtually all people with whom our nature unites us, whether they be enemies or allies, free or slaves".⁴ Just not "heretics!" Only not Manichaeans! Only not Pelagians! Only not Priscillianists! Only not Jews! Only not all other believers! Only not all unbelievers - "... all people"! Paper, paper, paper! The whole hypocrisy of this church, its snarling "Good News", its hecatombs devouring "love of the enemy", its disgusting peace palaver, all this is to be grasped here, a sickening duplicity, untruthfulness, which pervades its history, branding, mocking itself, pillorying itself, leading ad absurdum, from antiquity until today. The gospel of the executioner!

Or in other words: Leo the Great.

The pope comes back to the Manichaean theme remarkably often and almost always in a deeper way. He characterizes these people with always the same slurs as tools of Satan, liars, pests, falsifiers of Scripture, as "quite simple-minded people ... who in blind ignorance or out of sordid

Leo 1 as persecutor 267

lusts turn to things that are not holy but detestable. "50

Although Leo's "general sense of shame" prevents him from "going into it in greater detail," he nevertheless readily comes to these "things," "their immoral actions," which they "delight in, which likewise stain body and soul, which know neither purity of faith nor chastity," which "seem obscene." Thereby he warns - and at the same time insults - "above all" women to become acquainted with such people, to converse with them, "lest you fall into the snares of the devil, while your ear guilelessly rejoices in their fairy-tale stories! Since Satan knows that he seduced the first man by the mouth of a woman [!] and by the credulity of woman [!] drove all men out of the blessedness of Paradise, even now he pursues your sex with more confident cunning "51

While warning women, he defames them according to an old tradition cultivated by the greatest Christians of antiquity, Paul, John Chrysostom, Jerome, Augustine. For that the women are "mainly" destined to satisfy the lust of the men, as St. Chrysostom teaches, the pope could observe even among the Manichaeans. They revealed to his tribunal "a wicked deed, which one must be ashamed even to mention". But he mentions it, indeed, he himself had conducted the investigation about it "so embarrassingly that neither for those who do not really want to believe in the matter, nor for the habitual grumblers there can be the slightest doubt. All the persons were present with whose assistance the heinous deed was committed: a girl, of course, of no more than ten years of age, and two women who had raised her and destined her to such shameful work. Also present was the young person, barely out of boyhood, who had defiled the girl, and her own bishop, by whom such a despicable crime had been ordered. All these people testified one and the same thing in the same words.

z68 Pope Leo 1.

In the process, abominations came to light that we could hardly listen to. To have to offend chaste listeners by speaking more openly, that is what we are remitted by the evidence, from which it emerges most clearly that no discipline, no respectability, no trace of shamefulness is to be found in this sect, whose law is falsehood, whose religion is the devil, whose victims are disgraced".⁵²

Finally, in order to maintain "public order," Pope Leo obtained from Emperor Valentinian an aggravating rescript of June 19, 445, which repeated the earlier punishments, ordered Manichaeans to be treated in the same way as desecrators of a shrine, denied them civil rights and honors throughout the empire, and called Manichaeism a "publicum crimen," worthy of damnation "toto orbi." In doing so, anyone who gave shelter was guilty of the same crime. The accomplices also lost the freedom of

contract, the active as well as passive right of inheritance etc. "No overlooking", it says in the introduction, "tolerate more the recently uncovered crimes of the Manichaeans. What monstrous, unspeakable and outrageously shameless things have not been uncovered in the court of the most blessed Pope Leo before the illustrious Senate by their own open confession.... Of this we cannot fail to take cognizance, since it behooves us not to be remiss in the face of so detestable an insult to the Deity." This imperial order for the persecution of the Manichaeans, which once more shows the close interlocking of state and church, law and religion, *res Romana* and *ecclesia Romana*, had been drawn up in the papal typing pool, the pope himself had "a decisive share" in it, as Jesuit

Hugo Rahner writes, after having shortly before celebrated Leo's "fine and humane middle ground between this world and the flight from the world", shortly after "the love so often praised by Leo", "Leo's humanity as a secular deed". In reality, the law he instituted against the Manichaeans was "of a draconian severity" (Catholic Ehrhard), he had the Manichaeans persecuted to their "last hiding places" (Catholic Stratmann).⁵³

Leo I as Persecutor 269

The same Leo, however, who could drive the state to brutal persecution, could equally again demand noble forbearance and forgiveness from it. "Let the stern rule against our subjects be tempered, and let all vengeance for an offense be abolished! Let the guilty rejoice that they have yet seen those days in which, under the rule of pious and God-fearing princes, even the severe public punishments are abated! Let all hatred cease ..." The same Leo who incited the state to judge, banish, imprison, kill "heretics" could also again ask in a completely Christian evangelical way: "Let all vengeance cease and let every insult be forgotten!" ... "If, therefore, any one is so filled with vindictiveness against any one as to throw him into prison or put him in fetters, let him hasten to bring about his deliverance, not only if he is innocent, but even if he seems to have deserved the punishment!" The same Leo could shout, "Let no one have an oppressor on us ..." The same Leo knew that Jesus forbade "to defend him with an armed hand against the wicked." ⁴

Paper, paper, paper!

The pope's referral of the Manichaeans to the criminal jurisdiction of the state was in accordance with the juridical norms, the imperial "heretic" laws, but what was new was the close collaboration between the ecclesiastical and secular courts. And just as the beheading of Priscillian and his companions could be called the first bloody "heretic" trial, so 'Leo's Manichean attack the first "Inquisition" trial, this is not true even when judged strictly in legal terms.⁵⁵

Leo's English biographer Trevor Jalland finds the pope's action not only illuminating of his character, but also calls his Manichean hunt "the first known example of a partnership between Church and State in carrying out a policy of religious persecution." So far the state alone had suppressed the heterodox, now for the first time the church, in the person of the pope, had taken over this task; whereby of course the common persecution of Priscillianists, Donatists, Arians, of pagans, Jews already in the 4th century must be remembered, even if so far never a pope engaged himself in such an inquisitorial way.⁵⁶

A few years after the expulsion of the Manichaeans from Rome, Leo fought Priscillianism in Spain. The bishop there, Turibius of Astorga (Asturia Augusta), had noted their continued existence on a visitation trip around 445 and reported their most important "heresies" in sixteen chapters.⁵⁷

However, the Spanish bishop had reported relatively correctly, at any rate had informed the pope considerably more objectively than the latter's replica would suggest. For Leo "pressed the factual communications into his scheme and made of them a distorted picture of Priscillianism: the Priscillianists are placed alongside the Manichaeans" (Haendler).⁵⁸

In fact, the Roman generalizes here in the same way. What is just not papal is diabolical. Again he rages

against "this wicked heresy," "the abominable sect," the "godless frenzy," by which once again "every morality is shattered, every bond of marriage abolished, all divine and human right destroyed." Once, in the year 385, the first execution of Christians by Christians in Trier (1435 ff) had still outraged Christianity, the echo to the death sentence was allegedly even "among the most important bishops ... clearly negative" (Katholik Baus). But the oh so humane, moderate Leo, the hypocritical caller for mercy, elimination of every revenge, threat, every hatred, the so eloquent preacher of pardon, of the Good News embracing "all" people, of love of neighbor, of enemy, the man who teaches that Jesus does not want to see himself defended by armed hand, he is now happy about the Trier outrage, he passionately justifies the liquidation of Priscillian, his companions. "Rightly (Merito) our fathers, in whose times this impious heresy broke out, offered up everything in the whole world to eliminate this impious madness from the whole Church; even the secular princes detested this sacrilegious nonsense to such an extent that they accused the author of it and very many [!] (plurisque)

Leo "the Great" demonizes the Jews 271

Disciples cast down with the sword of the public laws." Leo "the Great" is also able to emphasize almost cynically the opportuneness of such "heretic" murder: "This severity has long been of use to ecclesiastical leniency, which, although satisfied with episcopal judgment, avoids bloody punishments, is nevertheless supported by the strict laws of Christian princes, since those who fear corporal punishments often take recourse to the spiritual remedy". Leo called a church assembly in Galicia against the Priscillianists, without, of course, being able to eradicate them completely. – Still a century later, in 565, the Synod of Braga (capital of the Suevi in the 5th/6th century), as a result of the Leonese advance, hurled no less than seventeen anathemas against the Priscillianists, apparently still numerous in Spain, and drove the bishops to more intense denial of the "heresy".⁵¹

Leo "the Great" Demonizes the Jews

Far less often than this pope's "heresy" offensives are his anti-Jewish outbursts documented or even merely mentioned. And yet Leo I also belongs to the long line of anti-Jewish church fathers from Justin, Irenaeus, Cyprian to Athanasius, Eusebius, Ephräm, Chrysostom, Jerome, Hilarius, Ambrose, Augustine (I ch. 2; also I 438 ff, 511 ff).

Even for Leo, so noble, mild, moderate (cf. p. 262), the Jews are only stupid, deluded, benighted, their priests "oblivious of God," their scribes "foolish"; their knowledge is "so ignorant," their learning "so unlearned." "They do not comprehend with their understanding what they have learned from the words of Scripture. Yet is truth a vexation to their foolish rabbis, yet becomes light darkness to their deluded scribes." Again and again it comes to the in this church until today so popular black-i-jz Pope Leo L white stencils, slogans of poster-like clumsiness, sectarian-like stultification campaigns of the simplest kind. Again and again there is the "darkness of ignorance", there "the light of faith", again and again there "the sons of darkness" fight, there "the true light" shines, again and again the "injustice ... against justice", "lies against truth", "delusion" against "wisdom" – eternally the same degoutant scheme.⁶⁰

Again and again this pope reproaches the Jews for the death of Jesus.

In ever new homilies he castigates their "conscienceless leaders and priests oblivious of their duty," "all the priests were dominated by the thought of how to carry out their crime against Jesus." All of them, "filled with the frenzy of patricidal hatred, have only one goal in mind," all of them are "equal to each other in cruelty." And finally, Pilate "gives up to the godless people the blood of the righteous . .".⁶¹ In line with the tendency already of the Gospels, Leo also incriminates the Jews and exonerates Pilate, the Roman, "even though he lent his arm to the enraged people ...". For "the hands of the Jews that served Satan" struck "his immaculately conceived flesh on the cross", "their impiety" was "harder than all tombstones and rocks". In contrast, "the warriors of Rome showed greater willingness to believe in

the Son of God ..." "On you, you false Jews and you God-forsaken leaders of the people, rests the whole weight of this outrage," "the whole responsibility." "The wrong that was done at the execution of the Lord Pilate by his sentence, and the soldiers by carrying out the order, makes you even more hateful in the eyes of the people."62

"That morning the sun did not rise for you, you Jews, but set. Not the usual light showed itself to your eyes, but terrible delusion enveloped your godless heart. That morning destroyed your temple and your altars, deprived you of the law and the prophets, abolished your kingship and priesthood, and turned all your festivals into eternal mourning; for unholy and cruel was your plan, which

Leo "the Great" demonizes the Jews 173

"author of life" and the "Lord of glory" to death, you "cowardly bulls and numerous farrows, you roaring beasts and raging dogs."63

More than once, Leo I compares the Jews to animals gone wild, to bulls, oxen, he invokes "the defiant and blind rage of cowardly bulls and the wild behavior of unruly bulls," he blasphemes them "roaring beasts of prey," yearning "for the blood of the righteous shepherd."64

Pope Leo "the Great" never tires of defaming the Jews. Again and again he reviles them "the raging persecutors", the "murderers", "sacrilegious", "the godless Jews", "godless and unbelieving Jews", the "carnal-minded Jews", "the criminal Jews", the "bloodthirsty elders," "the incited and blind," "the blinded and unforgiving," "the licentious people who looked after the eyes of the high priests" (just like the Catholic one looked after its popes for so many centuries!). Again and again Leo speaks of their "wicked deed", their "sacrilege", their "so terrible crime", of the "furious rage of the Jews", "blindness of the Jews", "wickedness of the Jews", "obduracy of the Jews", the "obduracy and cruelty of the godless". Always they are the "foolish scribes", the "god-forsaken priests", the "servants and mercenaries" of Satan, they are "rejected", "full of hypocrisy", "insults", "vituperations", "senseless mockeries". Always "the Jews, enraged, do to Jesus all that

they would," they hurl against "the Lord of glory" the "deadly projectiles of their speeches and the poisoned arrows of their words." "Again and again" he makes them cry, "Crucify him, crucify him!"

"From this you should know that you are rejected". "Rightly, therefore, both testaments condemn you".

For "all time" these acts of the Jews constitute for Pope Leo "an object of abhorrence."65

Such orgies of hatred had to poison the Christian people; had to lead to the ever stricter legal fight against the Jews, to the expropriation or burning down of their synagogues even in ancient times (I 439 ff), to the incessant pogroms of the

274 Pope Leo I.

Middle Ages and of modern times. Yes, as late as 1988, Catholic Krämer-Badoni writes precisely with regard to Pope Leo I: "The harshest discriminatory state laws were enacted under his pontificate, and of course not out of a blue sky. The Roman emperors had never interfered in religious matters when the religious adherents were politically loyal. The new intolerant role was imposed on them by the Church.

"66

All the agitations of Leo and the Church against the Jews as "murderers of God" are all the more grotesque, since the Jews were merely carrying out God's will. God wanted to be killed by them! He wanted to redeem the world in such a way! He had foreseen the whole procedure since eternity - at least since in his "plan of salvation" (see: "pair of progenitors", "original sin"-mishap, "Flood" and other) all kinds of things failed. So the Jews only executed. They were, Leo knows it himself, chosen by God to "promote the work of redemption", because their "unjust cruelty brought the redemption". Thus, for the "great" pope, they are an object "of disgust and yet also of joy". However, one notices nothing of joy about the Jews with him and just as little with all the other "famous" church-fatherly anti-Jewish bludgers. But it is a pity for every word about the absurdity of a theology which hates the Jews, lets

them persecute (often, too often) until death – and owes everything to them!⁶⁷

The "Star Hour of Mankind"

The most dazzling glory came to Leo in 1,452, when the Huns under Attila, after the heavy battle on the Catalaunian Fields near Poitiers, one of the great massacres of peoples in European history, broke unawares into Upper Italy over the unguarded passes of the Julian Alps, devastated it, plundered it, and overran Aquileia, Milan, Pavia. Their king Attila, besides Geiseric, with whom he was always in contact and successful, was the most powerful of all.

The "great hour of mankind" ⁷⁵ was undoubtedly the most important ruler of the time. But even then, the Huns – like the Russians in Nazi Germany – were perceived as a kind of subhuman race. Rather small, slow-skinned, so the Latin chroniclers describe them, with slit eyes in dark skin, covered with animal skins and without saddle on their wild little horses like the devil storming along, spreading terror, death ... "May Jesus continue to keep such beasts away from the Roman world!" prayed St. Jerome. In 452, however, some imperial envoys, the consul of the year 450 Gennadius Avienus, the former prefect Trygetius and precisely Bishop Leo hurried to meet the aggressor and requested his withdrawal at the Mincio near Mantua, between Lake Garda and the Po, whereupon Attila, the "scourge of God", refrained from further advance.

Much ink was shed because of this. And it was not by chance that the other two envoys were hardly mentioned. All the more, however, about Leo, who, by the way, spoke of it himself only once and remarkably briefly. He was celebrated – far more Christian legend than history – as the liberator of Italy from the Hun hordes, and it was even said that during the papal address to Attila the apostles Peter and Paul appeared in the air in Leo's support. Raphael created (1512/1514) the "star hour of humanity" (Kühner) in a famous fresco painting of the Vatican Stanza d'Eliodoro. Algardi decorated with the same scenery (under Innocent X) the tomb altar of Leo. But when another time the father of Cassiodorus (leading statesman under Theoderic the Great, then monk) and Car-pilio, the son of Aetius, obtained the withdrawal of the Hun army at such a petition, much less fuss was made about it. And at Mantua, Attila did not hold back Leo's tongue, eloquent as always, but for a man of his ilk, whom a Roman bishop would hardly frighten more than a Roman senator, quite different things: lack of food for his soldiers, the horses, various epidemics in the army, unrest in his rear, an uncovered advance, the difficulty of fighting in the central Italian mountains with

⁷⁶ Pope Leo I cavalry to operate, an impending attack by Eastern Rome on Pannonia, the Hunnic Empire, perhaps the memory of Alaric's sudden death soon after the capture of Rome.⁶⁸

In any case, in the centuries to come, so many Catholic princes often did not care in the least about papal "wishes—and so Bishop Leo, of all people, should have been respected by an Attila, prompted to such meaningful, such momentous conclusions? Should the king of the Huns, according to Prosper Tiro, have been so pleased by "the presence of the highest prince of the Church [!]" that "he refrained from continuing the war, promised to keep the peace and withdrew into the Danubian country"?⁶⁹

Still in our time one celebrates on the Catholic side Leo therefore as a savior of Europe, the 5th century as "a turning point for Occident and church". For: "In the raging sea of the migration of peoples Pope Leo I stood like a rock in the surf. One would almost like to call him a <Pope of Catholic Action>." And to "DEEPEN" his insight, Catholic theologian Josef Fuchs brings a "PANEL PICTURE 19a Pope Leo I, the Great defended mankind in the natural realm: 1. By saving the Occident from annihilation by the Huns..." And just opposite, on the next page, Fuchs brings us "PANEL PICTURE 19b The Church defends our human dignity by warning against communism..." Thus, in this "Commentary for the Catechist," wherein "the reference to the corpus Christi mysticum shines forth everywhere" (O. Berger), things undoubtedly move into contemporary view.⁷⁰

Attila returned to Pannonia and died surprisingly the very next year, 453, in the bridal bed probably of a

Germanic woman, perhaps the beautiful Burgundian princess Ildico, in wine intoxication, in love exhaustion - one of the most famous wedding nights in history and world literature. For the Huns, according to Hermann Schreiber in his biography of Attila, "a real Hun death, a royal death". For even if they were intrepid fighters, they possessed "wisdom of life and Sternstunde der Menschheit "277 art of living enough to appreciate happily the one who died "out of the midst of joy." Schreiber rightly admires that it did not come to any accusation of the young woman by the Huns. "Even a thousand years later, Ildico would have been tortured until she admitted to being a witch who brought about Attila's death with an evil love spell. "71

Apparently, however, the love of the two was so well known in the king's immediate surroundings that suspicion of murder did not even arise; while in the Byzantine tradition, that of the West, in the monastic chronicles, the Christian heroic poems and heroic sagas, accusations of murder flourished luxuriantly.⁷¹

In the pious Occident at all, hardly coincidentally, very distorted, false ideas about the Huns circulate. Of course, they defeated entire peoples in bloody battles, but then they did not enslave the subjugated without rights, as the Christians so often did (among whose peasants the Turks were sometimes more popular than their Christian masters). The groups incorporated into the Hun Empire gained full parity, indeed, were in certain cases preferred by the ruler to his own eastern tribes. "This is certainly an exceptional phenomenon in the whole of human development," writes Michael de Ferdinandy, "and yet conceivably simple to explain: for the victorious nomad, the defeated enemy, if he has not proved to be a breaker of words or a traitor, immediately turns into a friend ... But the leader of a defeated or voluntarily submitting people is appointed to the council of the Grand Khan. And this is not done "pro forma." The Ostrogoth king Walamer becomes Attila's most trusted friend, the Gepid king Ardarich furthermore Attila's designated successor ... The Germanic peoples have then also kept faith with the memory of their once great ruler..." - a man, by the way, who also fought with the "sword of the gods", admittedly that of the Huns.⁷³

Leo I, however, could not (anymore) particularly impress the Vandals three years later.

278 Pope Leo 1.

At that time, Petronius Maximus had publicly struck down Emperor Valentinian III, the desecrator of his domestic honor, on March 16, 455, and forced his widow Eudoxia to marry him. Eudoxia, however, summoned the Vandal king Geiseric, whose fleet then appeared at the mouth of the Tiber. Panic atmosphere in Rome! Now Leo confronted the Vandals. But now there was no more "star hour". The invaders plundered the city -without murder and fire- for fourteen days by every trick in the book. The pope himself had to deliver the most precious church vessels with his own hand. Emperor Maximus and his son died during their escape (allowed by Geiseric), Maximus probably by a bodyguard. Father and son were torn to pieces by the people and thrown into the Tiber. Thousands of prisoners, among them Empress Eudoxia and her daughters Eudocia and Placidia, were dragged away by the Vandals, irreplaceable works of art in addition, of which they lost not a few forever on the return journey by shipwreck.⁷⁴

However, neither Leo's behavior nor his Christianity seems to have impressed the Romans very much. The high preacher himself cries out indignantly: "It is extremely dangerous when people are ungrateful to God, when they no longer want to remember his benefits, when they show neither contrition over their chastisement nor joy over their deliverance.... I am ashamed to say it (Pudet dicere), but I must not be silent: The pagan idols are honored more than the apostles. Mad spectacles are more diligently attended than the churches of the holy martyrs. "75

Even Leo I had reason to state, "The dignity of St. Peter is not lost even in an unworthy heir" (Petri dignitas etiam in indigno haerede non deficit). One of the old, clumsily devious, but understandably

from century to century less and less dispensable tricks of Catholica. And, of course, Leo – who could declare that the Church "itself shrinks from bloody punishment," but leaves this punishment to the Christian princes, "in that the fear of capital punishment leads people to spiritual and religious punishment" – felt that he was being used by the Church as a means of punishment.

The "great hour of mankind" "Z79 rather healing" – anything but unworthy. And the Church counts this ancient inquisitor among its greatest popes. He became a saint and – through Benedict XIV in 1754 – a Doctor of the Church, indeed, he was given the epithet "the Great"! "Humility, meekness, and love toward all men were the chief traits of the holy chief shepherd, and for this reason emperors and princes, high and low, pagans and the coarsest peoples honored and loved him" (Donin).⁷⁶

THE WAR IN AND AROUND THE CHURCHES UNTIL EMPEROR JUSTIN (518)

Monophysitism became the national religion of Christian Egypt and Abyssinia and also prevailed in western Syria and Armenia in the 6th century; Nestorianism, with its doubt about the Mother of God, conquered Mesopotamia and eastern Syria. But this had an important political consequence: half of Egypt and the Middle East welcomed the Arabs in the 7th century as liberators from the religious, political and financial yoke of the Byzantine capital." K. Bosl¹

"... the strongest condemnation of the Confession of Chalcedon as a decree imposed on the Oriental churches lies in the history of the next two hundred years, in the period from 451 to about 650, from Chalcedon to the invasion of Islam: most terrible revolts of the people and the monks, namely in Egypt, in Palestine and parts of Syria against the Chalcedonense open this period, and at the end of these two hundred years stand the firmly organized Monophysite national churches in Armenia, Syria, Egypt and Abyssinia, which were filled with bitterest hatred against the Greek imperial church in Byzantium." Fr. Kawerau²

The East is in bright flames or: "... the devil, you and Leo".

The great council, which was often compared to the "Robber Synod" (p. 237), which Harnack calls "in distinction from the Robber Synod, Robber and Traitor Synod," did not calm the minds. On the contrary, it put them in an uproar. It became the beginning of many new calamities, a nuisance and an impetus for a division that continues to this day, whereby each side, of course, considered itself "orthodox", "orthodox", and still does.

Chalcedon was an imperial church synod, the decisions became imperial law. And since the terms of art given to the new doctrine: Being, nature, substance (usia, physis, hypostasis) were used differently by the Greek thinkers, theological speculators and disputants had hardly exhaustible possibilities to talk past each other and to heresy each other, especially since the concept of the person (Greek prosopon) contributed by the Latins was abundantly ambiguous and the West was particularly affected by the quarrel until the death of Pope Gregory I (604).³

Now, of course, the post-Chalcedonian development is not being questioned here for "its inspirational power for a Christological spirituality" (Grillmeier). Heavens, no. "Only" the (ecclesiastical) political consequences interest us, the incessant religious quarrels, the advocacy of "orthodoxy," of "heresies," the eternal church quarrels, all the hatred, the blood, the uprisings, military operations, in Palestine especially, in Egypt, the

The East is on fire 283

banishments, incarcerations, liquidations, all the decades of conflict between emperors and popes until the agreement finally reached by Pope Hormisdas and Emperor Justin I almost seventy years later, which of course brings no peace, which brings new intensified persecutions.⁴

People were now quick to impute Nestoria-like tendencies to the Church Assembly. The synodals were even called Nestorians, later also "Diphysites" (people of two natures). The followers of St. Cyril ignored his Christology in Chalcedon and saw in the distinction of the two natures emphasized by Leo I

pure Nestorianism, an atrocious "heresy"! (In fact, Nestorios, who is ostracized until today, had prepared the Christological formula of Chalcedon, he had welcomed the Leonian formulations as his own justification – the pope, however, condemned the exile in the desert, with the council, once again! Now, however, even Jesuit Wilhelm de Vries apparently recognizes in the synods of the Persian church of the Nestorians in the 5th and 6th century [except at most Seleucia: 486] "a quite correct Christology."⁵

Opposition to Chalcedon thus did not come from the Nestorians. It came from the Monophysites in Egypt, where the successors of the schismatic patriarchs reside in unbroken succession to the present day, and in Syria, the strongholds of Monophysitism, where the monasticism fervently admired by the multitude was also Monophysite. He came from the Monophysites in Arabia, Abyssinia, where uncounted Syrian Christians fled after 451. It came from Persia, Armenia and led to the separation of whole peoples of the East from Catholicism. In the 6th century a variety of Christian sects dominated the southeastern edge of the Mediterranean: Severians, Julianists, Phantasiasts, Theodosians, Gajanites, Phthartolaters, Actists, Themistians, Trities, Tetradites, Niobites. And these all and more favored the expansion of Islam in the 7th century, which cashed in on Palestine, Syria, Egypt, and gave rise to numerous national churches, some of which still exist today.⁶

284 The war in and around the churches

Still throughout the Middle Ages, the Monophysite bishops, theologians, historians attack the "heresy of the hypocritical council," the "filthy faith of the heretical council," as written in the earlier 9th century by the bishop of Takrit, Abū Ra'ita, for whom "the ignorant Markianos" is simply "the second Jeroboam." A little later, the Coptic Severos, bishop of Usmūnain, claims in his "Book of Councils" that Dioskoros had received "a powerful slap" from the empress in Chalcedon – "powerful" praises Pulcheria also the "Lexicon for Theology and Church", "heiress of the spirit of her grandfather Theodosius I" –, which had been the occasion "for further maltreatment of Dioskoros". According to the Jacobite historian Barhebraeus (1225–1286), the most famous writer of his nation, the saint had sexual intercourse with her husband despite her vow of virginity; according to Nestorios, incidentally, also with her brother Theodosius. (In fact, Pulcheria was not considered sacred in antiquity, when her bravado was in some respects still too drastic to contemplate. This veneration, writes the ecclesiastical encyclopedia just mentioned, "is only demonstrable in the Middle Ages.") Even Ignatios Nūh (Noe), patriarch of the Jacobites in the early 16th century, speaks of Chalcedon as "this accursed council" that was "condemned by the mouth of the Lord," and has Dioskor tell the emperor Marcian, "the friend of the devil," "It is enough that in this council there are three heads: the devil, you, and Leo."⁷

Pulcheria, Marcian and Leo, that was enough, in any case, for almost the whole East to be in flames after the synod, so highly gratifying for Rome, all things considered.

In Alexandria, whose archbishop Dioskor had been exiled to Paphlagonia in November 451, the excited Christian people, on hearing the news of the council's outcome, burned alive the imperial garrison together with the church, the former temple of Serapis, where they had taken refuge. Marcian appealed to the Alexandrians to unite with the "holy and catholic church of the orthodox". "With such action you will

The East is on fire 285

save your souls and accomplish godly things." But soon he allowed them no further propaganda against the council and imposed a long series of punishments on "heretics" in the sharp constitution "Licet iam sacra-tissima." Only under wild street battles, under murder and manslaughter, Dioskor's apostate confidant, the archdeacon Proterios (451–457), could be consecrated by only four equally apostate bishops in November 451, take possession of his chair and hold it with papal recognition and under constant strong troop protection. The people and the monks, but also many clerics, continued to stand

by Dioskor, while Proterios, the "true disciple of the apostles" (Leo I), had his main support in Emperor Marcian. Shortly after Marcian's death in January 457, however, as we shall soon see, an even more violent uproar broke out in Alexandria, in which monks were again particularly involved.⁸

In the East, it was precisely the monks who fomented the resistance to Chalcedon. Other groups of monks, however, tirelessly agitated for it. In any case, on all fronts "the monks were in the front line" (Bacht SJ).

n,zi In Palestine there was a bloody monk revolt even before the end of the Council. Here the monk chiefs Romanos and Markianos and the religious and counter-bishop Theodosius (451–453), a pious zealot and follower of Dioskor, who is said to have already aroused tumults at Chalcedon, conquered Jerusalem with ten thousand fanatical ascetics for about twenty months before fleeing to Mount Sinai. Meanwhile, the ambitious Juvenal, patriarch of

the city from 422 to 458, whom the monks not unjustly accused of having broken his "oaths and promises," of having betrayed the theology of Cyril, lost his chair. In 431 he had presented forged documents in Ephesus to support his claims to power, the expansion of his territory (by three provinces: Phoenicia I and II as well as Arabia) and had significantly favored Cyril. In 449, he went over to the opposite side, was, along with Dioskor, probably the most prominent leader of the "Council of Robbers," and among 113 bishops, the

z86 The War in and around the Churches

first to advocate the rehabilitation of Eutyches, whom he found "quite orthodox." At Chalcedon, he quickly changed fronts again. He shamefully abandoned Dioskor, his old ally, professed the latter's banishment and the rehabilitation of Flavian. Now he fled – need I say that he is revered as a saint in the Orient (feast: July 2)? – head over heels to the emperor in Constantinople.

But in Jerusalem, Theodosios, supported by the people and the monks, took his place. The monks burned houses and committed atrocity upon atrocity. They killed the bishop of Scythopolis, Severianos, after his return from the council, together with his company – not the only bishop they killed. Many bishoprics now fell into the hands of Monophysites, who soon dominated all of Palestine, but were soon driven out again – admittedly not without troop deployments, a real battle. The uprising was co-financed by Empress Eudokia, who had resided in Jerusalem since 443, the widow of Theodosios II. Disintegrated with the court, she resisted the attack of Pulcheria, her hated sister-in-law, and Marcian on Eutyches. Through Eudokia, her influence, her intrigues, almost every monastery around the "Holy City" is said to have fallen away from Juvenal. On the other hand, from Rome, the pope drove against the "rods of false monks", the mercenaries of the Antichrist, as he wrote to Julian of Kios in November 452, not without also accusing the fugitive Juvenal. Two years ago, Leo even did not want Juvenal's name (along with that of Dioskor and Eusthatius of Berytus) to be mentioned in the service. But this great forger and front changer before the Lord was such an efficient missionary that he had consecrated the chief of a Bedouin tribe as the first "bishop of the tent camps" already around 425 – and later also climbed the "honor of the altars": deservedly! But in January 454 Leo had to thank the sovereign that he had returned Juvenal to his chair by force! And on September 4 of that year he incited the patriarch himself to more rigorous attacks! Leo also demanded the eradication of the Eutychians. They should all, like

The East is on fire 287

Dioskor's appendix, be taken to where they would be harmless and criminally prosecuted.⁹

Emperor Marcian, the compliant aide of Pulcheria and the pope, who then also attested to him the union of "royal power with priestly zeal," had announced \ measures against all refusers of his definition while still at Chalcedon: simple private citizens were to be expelled from the capital, military officers and clerics deposed. He considered further punishments possible. Between February and July 452 alone,

he issued four decrees confirming as well as inculcating the council's decisions and, especially in the fourth of these decrees, dated July 18, 452, he took action against the "Eutychians." He forbade their meetings, teachings, their preaching, forbade them to ordain bishops and priests, to build monasteries. He forbade them clergy and their monks any monastic community. He denied them testamentary and hereditary capacity, banished them from Constantinople, but clergy and monks of the Eutychian monastery from the whole empire. Whoever received them was threatened with confiscation and deportation, whoever heard their sermon had to pay ten pounds of gold. The monks were maltreated with laws like those applied to "heretics" and Manichaeans. Their writings against Chalcedon had to be burned, their owners, spreaders, deported. And soon he fought with troops for the "right" faith.¹⁰ The emperor of the council also persecuted the pagans with all brutality. In 451, he threatened pagan cult acts with confiscation and execution, both of which affected the performers, the helpers and the accomplices. The punitive fine for governors neglecting the law—20 pounds of gold in 407—Marcian increased to 50 pounds of gold each for the governor and his agency.¹¹

z88 The War in and around the Churches

Pope Leo incites against the Christian "devils" of the East.

Behind all the anti-Heretical attacks, however, stood Leo I. Again and again he sought to prevent any renewed discussion of the council's decisions, to keep the "heretics" at bay, and to create a strictly isolated exile for the monk-rebels.

Triumphantly, he reported to the Gallic bishops that no one was allowed to defend the "heresy" after Chalcedon under the pretext of ignorance, "because the synod of almost 600 of our brothers and fellow bishops, assembled for this very reason, did not allow any disputation or eloquent discussion to take place against the divinely founded faith.... These monstrous mendacities of devilish mind have now been separated from the Church of God by the holy Synod – by cursing this blot".¹²

In Constantinople, Julian, an Italian educated in Rome who had become bishop of Kios near Nicaea and thus knowledgeable of Greek, acted as Leo's permanent vicar against the current "heretics" (*contra temporis nostri haereticos*). According to the official letter of appointment of March 11, 453, the pope thus had his, so to speak, accredited informer at court, his overseer, confidant, mediator, whip. He should, as Leo repeatedly demanded, fight the "heretics", including the oppositional monks, i.e. have them prosecuted by the emperor and the secular courts. Julian had to, he ordered him, "take special care as my vicegerent (*vice mea functus*) that the Nestorian and Eutychian heresies do not revive anywhere; for there is no Catholic strength in the bishop of Constantinople." Against him, "as he deserves to raise me, I defer...". The Leonine vicar, however, had to keep an eye on the patriarch of the capital as well as on the empress dowager Eudokia, who was fomenting monastic revolt in Jerusalem and Palestine, or on the unrest of the Egyptian monks. Last but not least, however, Bishop Julian was supposed to have stopped the bigoted emperor and empress, who lived in "Joseph's marriage," whose priestly

Pope Leo incites against the Christian "devils" of the East 189

Leo repeatedly praised their priestly work, whose "duty to protect" the Church he demanded even more frequently, for the benefit of Rome. To the monarch himself, Leo recommended that Julian's "submissions (*suggestiones*) be listened to as if they were mine." ¹³

This supposedly so moderate, humane hierarch (p. 262) never hesitated to make life as sour as possible for his opponents, to at least silence them even more radically, in which he had a compliant tool in Emperor Marcian, the former general who had been married to the nun Pulcheria. Thus he wrote to him on 15. April 454: "Since, however, you gladly accept my suggestions for the tranquility of the Catholic faith, you may know that I have been informed by communication from my brother and fellow bishop Julian that the impious Eutyches, though deservedly in exile, but still in the place of his condemnation (*damnationis loco*) against the Catholic totality, he is pouring out much venom of his

blasphemy full of despair, and with still greater shamelessness he is spewing out what in him the whole world has detested and condemned, so that he can deceive harmless people (inno-centes). I think it very wise, therefore, if your clemency orders him to be taken to a more distant and hidden place. "14 For all the imperial measures, Leo expressed his high satisfaction to Bishop Julian of Kios and St. Empress Pulcheria in March 453. And, of course, it was a special joy to him when the regent had the Comes Dorotheus restore "order" by force of arms. Many monks lost their lives in the process. The Archimandrites Romanos and Timotheos were imprisoned in Antioch, and the dethroned Patriarch Theodosios was dragged to a monastic prison in Constantinople. Pope Leo, however, praised the bloody work in a letter to the Majesty as a work of faith and "fruit of imperial piety" (*vestrae fidei opus, vestrae pietatis est fructus*). Sickness must be brought to health, turmoil to peace. "I rejoice, therefore ... that your kingdom, since Christ guides it, is tranquil, since Christ protects it, is powerful". Leo

290 The war in the churches and around the churches

did not cease to pray for Marcian, as he wrote to him two years before the latter's death, "because the Church and the Roman Res Publica are much promoted by your good from God. "15

Even under Emperor Leo I, Pope Leo CONTINUES TO DEMAND VIOLENCE AGAINST "THE CRIMINALS" AND CONDEMNS ANY TREATMENT.

Pulcheria, whose "care of a holy heart pleasing to the Lord" the Pope is so fond of praising, not without adding that she should "also keep in practice," died in July 453, Marcian on January 26, 457 - Leo's prayers for long life for the majesty went unheard.

The imperial dignity was supposedly offered to the powerful Magister militum Flavius Ardabur Aspar, an Arian "heretic", son of a Goth and a high Alans. But Aspar, a Roman general from 424 to 471 but not a partisan of orthodoxy, refused (or was refused). Thus, according to some with his help, on February 7 one of his officers attained the purple, Leo I (457-474), whose unfounded distrust eventually victimized Aspar, who had proven himself in the service of three emperors. Leo, a strict Catholic, who paid great attention to the sanctification of holidays, especially venerated the column saint Daniel and was given the

epithet "the Great" by the church, had Aspar and his son Patricius, who had been elevated to the rank of Caesar by Leo himself, murdered in the imperial palace in 471, whereby the ruler's bigoted Catholicism towards his Arian and anti-Chalcedonian victim also played a role.¹⁶

When, after the death of Emperor Marcian (457), the Monophysite opposition grew stronger and stronger, Pope Leo emphasized more and more decisively the binding nature of the Chalcedonian decree of faith; "any renegotiation" of what had been "decided on inspiration of God," or, as he

Even under Emperor Leo I, Pope Leo continued to demand violence_291

wrote another time, "what so eminent an authority (*tanta auctoritas*) determined by the Holy Spirit."

Thus, not only did Leo himself decline an invitation to Constantinople, but he also instructed his legates not to engage in any discussion after the delivery of his doctrinal letter of August 17, 458 (a kind of supplement to the doctrinal letter to Flavian, hence later called *Tomus II*).¹⁷

Tirelessly, however, the Roman pressed on against the "heretical perversity" of so many in the East, especially in Constantinople, Antioch, and Egypt. Everywhere he wanted to enforce, as he wrote to Bishop Julian, what had been decreed at Chalcedon "under the guidance of the Holy Spirit for the salvation of the whole world." For the sake of this "salvation" he addressed bishops, presbyters, deacons, he sent envoys, as on August 17, 458 the bishops Domitianus and Geminianus, to the court, he wrote again and again also to the new emperor Leo, about whose virtues "the Roman state and the Christian religion may rejoice". But, as always, when the church emphatically strives for "salvation" for itself, disaster for others could only, had to result from it. Pope Leo urged the imperial *filius ecclesiae* to take appropriate action, to restore the "*Christiana libertas*"; which, if possible, always means: bondage for all

others. He implores the emperor "that he, mindful of the common faith ... he implores the emperor "that he, mindful of the common faith ... thwart all heretical machinations", incites him himself again and again to resist the "murderous hands of godless people", the "great guile", the "wickedness of the heretics", urges to punish "the criminals". He calls for purges of the clergy, demands that the prince "triumph over the enemies of the Church; for if it is glorious for you to destroy the arms of opposing peoples [!], how great will be your glory when you free the Alexandrian Church from its raging tyrant!" One sees here, as again and again, what popes are concerned with: annihilation of external enemies of the empire and annihilation of all internal enemies. "Recognize, venerable emperor ... what help you owe to your mother church?

z?2 The war in the churches and around the churches dest, which boasts of you as her son in a special way." Weapons, violence Leo "the Great" wanted to be used, but no council, no religious discussion. He abhorred disputes in general, especially in matters of faith. Even to the emperor, he repeatedly emphasized that any possibility of negotiation must be ruled out – and yet at the same time he asserted: "We are not vindictive, but we cannot associate ourselves with the servants of the devil."18

To the radical intolerance also, as usual, the whitewash. Leo's last sentence is fatally reminiscent of St. Jerome's, quoted and commented on earlier: "We too desire peace, and we not only desire it, we demand it, but the peace of Christ, the true peace" (p. 144). The same attitude, the same hypocrisy. Leo's letters to the East are pure inflammatory letters wrapped in pious phrases. They always revolve around one and the same theme, they always urge subjugation, elimination, destruction of the enemy, who is always and again insulted as godless, wicked, satanic, criminal, who is clumsily demonized. Only "the Antichrist and the devil," suggests the pope to Emperor Leo I on December 1, 457, would dare to besiege the "impregnable fortress." Only those who "in their heart's malice do not allow themselves to be converted," who "under the pretense of zeal for the soul scatter their seed of lies and pretend that it is the fruit of their search for truth." Unbridled rage and blind hatred have "concocted deeds that can only be called with contempt and disgust – but.... The Lord God has made Your Majesty so rich in enlightenment about His mysteries. Therefore you must never forget: The imperial power is conferred upon you not only for the government of the world, but above all [!] for the protection of the Church (sed maxime ad Ecclesiae praesi-dium) ... Now then, it would be a great thing for you if, in addition to your imperial diadem, you could receive from the Lord's hand the crown of faith, if you could celebrate a triumph over the enemies of the Church!"1'

They are, after all, Christians, priests, whose crushing of the

Even under Emperor Leo 1, Pope Leo continues to demand violence _293

Pope demands from the Emperor, Christians, priests, whom he despises, abhors, whom he accuses of lies, hatred, unbridled rage, whom he calls "antichrist" and "devil" – language, admittedly, rampant since the beginning in the "best", the leading Christian circles (I ch. 3).

Many apologists, who devalue studies of critical researchers, like Erich Caspar, even more works of Eduard Schwartz, Johannes Haller and many others, by their "exclusively political consideration" as "burdened", have for their part the greatest difficulty to see the main motive of the popes not as political, but, of course, like Fritz Hofmann, for example, as "a genuinely religious one" – and yet they themselves have to "emphasize" that the "struggle for Chalcedon," for more than half a century the "center of all papal efforts," took place "largely on the political level." xo

But what is widely played out on the political level is also widely political, mainly political, basically even only political – a single struggle for power: power within one's own Church; power within competing Churches; and for power over all others. History proves this! The religious is merely pretended. It is only a means to an end. That many and especially well-intentioned, gullible – but not well-informed – Christians see, feel, experience this quite differently, does not change the facts, the

reality. Admittedly, also these Christians, also and especially the "religious forces" belong to this reality, yes, make it, as its basis, its precondition, possible in the first place. But all this remains "private" – and what makes unscrupulously cynical use of it, abuses it terribly for life (sometimes still with the excuse, the self-deception "I have mercy on the people"), that makes history, world history: criminal history.

294 The war in the churches and around the churches

Battles of faith between Christians

The Christological controversy, the struggle between Chalcedonians and Monophysites, raged through the East of the Roman Empire with hardly imaginable intensity. The second half of the 5th century, the whole 6th century are filled with it. The defamations, depositions, banishments, the riots, intrigues, murders and manslaughters never end. One side of the Christianity always tries to reject the formula of Chalcedon, the other to enforce it. The Monophysites were united in their opposition to the "accursed" Synod, to Chalcedon and to Rome. The acts of violence, persecutions, martyrdoms, always demanded by Orthodoxy, often carried out by the government, only increased the confessional hatred, the resistance. And the compromises sought by some emperors, their occasional yielding, concessions, concessions, all this failed mainly because of the renitence of Catholicism. Of course, as is usually the case, there was much more at stake, less the Christological palaver, the dogma of the two natures, than influence, ambition, money and power, the nationalism, not least of the Egyptians or Syrians. For despite all the inflamed delusion of faith, there was a certain "national" struggle for existence of the Orientals behind it. Behind all this, and closely linked to it, was the social antagonism between the natives, the Syrian Semites, for example, or the native Fellahs of the Nile country, the Copts, and the thin, more or less educated Greek upper class, the rich Greek landlords, who, supported by imperial officials, police, officers, clergy, professed the official imperial church. And from this ruling class, from the foreign oppressors who ruthlessly fleeced them, the natives sought protection from the monks they effusively admired, the bishops of the land, who, of course, abused them in their own way.²¹

In the foreground, however, was the spectacle of faith.

Battles of faith between Christians 195

Especially in Alexandria, the center of opposition, the opponents of Chalcedon rose up. And if Pope Leo had spoken in 454 of the darkness "that nests in Egypt," this darkness became even denser.²²

The Alexandrian patriarch Dioskoros I, deposed at Chalcedon as a follower of Eutyches, had been succeeded by Proterios (451–457), a Catholic loyal to the Council (through whom Leo admittedly suffered a defeat on the question of the Easter date dispute, which Rome accepted only with fury). And soon after Marcian's death on January 26, 457, Proterios was opposed by the Monophysite monk–priest Timotheos (457–460), surnamed Ailuros ("Weasel"), a faithful of Dioskoros who was canonically consecrated by two bishops on March 16. For years he is said to have incited the monks of Alexandria against Proterios, even appearing as an angel at night time in front of the cells of the Anachoretes with the admonition to avoid Proterios and to elect Timotheos (himself) as bishop. If the story, which has been handed down several times, is true, it shows what could be expected of these monks,

if it is false, what could be expected of the world – which, of course, can be expected of anything at any time. Although Timotheos Ailuros was immediately arrested by the imperial governor, and the chased Proterios was brought back to Alexandria with military, he was already murdered on March 28, 457 by a frenzied mob of Christians during the service (on Holy Thursday or Good Friday) in the church of Quirinus. His body was desecrated, torn to pieces, burned – he himself saint of the Roman Church (feast: February 28).

Subsequently, Archbishop Timotheos Ailuros – Leo I calls him a "wicked murderer" (parricida), in any case he was the beneficiary of the murder – "purged" the Egyptian episcopate of opponents. All the bishops who resisted he deprived of their chair. Against the pope, as well as the patriarchs of

Constantinople and Antioch, he hurled the ban at a synod in Alexandria – apparently revenge for the fall of Dioscor, the rise of Constantinople, and probably for the Ignorie

z\$6 The war in the churches and around the churches

ration of Cyrillic Christology at Chalcedon. In 460, however, Emperor Leo had the Alexandrian removed – repeatedly and intensely urged by the pope, who flooded the Orient with mail and implored the regent not only to be ruler of the world but also protector of the Church. Timotheos Ailuros was banished, first to Paphlago-nia, then to the Crimea. But the Alexandrian throneos was ascended by Timotheos Salopha-kiolos ("wagging hat"), who was elevated by only ten bishops – a "new David in mildness and patience" (see David: I 85 f).²³

Leo was still sending letters of congratulations and exhortation to Egypt in August 460–his last mail to be preserved. Elated, he congratulated the newly appointed "Wiggle Hat," commended Emperor Leo for driving out his predecessor, the "wicked patricide"–and died the next fall on November 10.²⁴

Leo I, the first towering papal figure in history, as skilled a pragmatist as he was a doctrinaire, the perfect blend of the two, nevertheless resembled in his behavior, as Haller already aptly recognized, less a lion than a fox. He could be submissive to the top, to Emperor Leo I, in such a shameless way, as if he were the standard bearer of Caesaropapism (p. Z54 f). And he could, it seemed opportune, decidedly turn out the gentleman even towards higher lords. A diplomat through and through, he could advance and retire, buck and kick, and build himself up like nothing else in the world. Above all, however, he was able to kujonieren the own clergy. He could scorn veritable saints and deny the priesthood to "shabby" slaves. He could demand humility and obedience from the flock and for himself in the church the authority over all, the highest rank, the highest honor – under pretense also still of modesty. Above all, however, he was able to persecute and persecute relentlessly everything that was not Catholic, through incarceration, banishment, physical extermination – while proclaiming love of neighbor and enemy, complete forgiveness, any renunciation of revenge. He repeatedly spanned the

Pope Hilarus, Emperor Anthemius Z97

Emperors for himself, without letting himself be harnessed by them very much, without caring about the collapsing emperorship of the West, whose impotence he rather used for his own purposes, whose last power he played off against the East, in order to profit in this way as well, although in his late years with less and less success. Yet Leo's decisions continued to shape ecclesiastical law for centuries to come. And his authority was such that his letters became a favorite object of Christian forgers.²⁵

Pope Hilarus, Emperor Anthemius, and

CHRISTIAN PREDATOR-REGENT GROTESQUES.

Leo I was succeeded on November 19 by the sardinian Hilarus (461–468)–"not by merit but by divine grace"–that deacon of the Roman Church who once steeled himself from the "Robber Synod" so precipitously that he endowed a chapel in Rome in gratitude for his salvation (p. 223).

His experience of the East left a deep impression on Hilarus. He wrote almost exclusively to Western addressees, especially to Spanish and Gallic bishops. In contrast, from his pontificate, which lasted a good seven years, there is not a single letter about the Christological problems of Chalcedon, indeed, apart from a tiny fragment, none at all to the Orient! The troubled conditions of southern Gaul, Germanic conquests there, the usurpation of the bishop's see of Narbonne by Hermes, his partial disenfranchisement, the continuing rivalry of Arles and Vienne, certain turmoil also in Spain, all this does not explain it enough; especially since the pope also had time to persecute the "Macedonians" in Rome (favored by Emperor Anthemius), but above all to indulge in a lavish passion for building, to further decorate the Lateran and, after the Wandalic sack, to pompously build other "places of worship," St. Peter, St. Paul, S. Lorenzo. The Roman church was already the richest of the

298 The war in the churches and around the churches whole Christian world, far richer than even the

church of Constantinople, of Alexandria. While the city was becoming more and more run down, impoverished, decaying, the basilicas sparkled with fabulous splendor: baptismal fountains with silver stags, confessions with arches of gold, crosses covered with precious stones, altars glittering with preciousness ... Yet in all the pope's correspondence, "Not a single religious problem..." (Ullmann).²⁶ In foreign policy, Emperor Leo I, the bigoted Catholic, made a tremendous effort several generations before Justinian to destroy the Arian Vandal Empire, whose religion was as abhorrent to the Catholic Romans as its Germanic race and customs.

Since there had been no emperor in the West since late 465, Leo appointed Marcian's son-in-law Anthemius as Caesar for the West in 467. Anthemius, already victorious over the Ostrogoths and the Huns, entered Italy with an army, became Augustus there and threatened Geiserich with war through the Eastern Roman Empire in case of further hostilities against Western Rome. When Geiserich himself declared war, Eastern Rome prepared an army for the huge sum of 64,000 pounds of gold and 700,000 pounds of silver, to which the Byzantine financial difficulties of the following century were attributed. However, the Germanic "heretic" empire was to disappear from Africa. However, Leo's Vandal War, in which his brother-in-law Basiliskos, the brother of Empress Verina, allegedly commanded 1100 ships and more than 100,000 men in 468, was certainly considerably exaggerated, a complete fiasco; although victory was almost in the bag, at the last moment they succumbed once again to the cunning of old Geiseric, who also cashed in on all the conquests made by Eastern Rome.²⁷

Emperor Anthemius (467-472) was religiously indifferent, if not secretly hostile to Christians. He made an Old Believer philosopher city prefect and antagonized Pope Hilarus. His tolerance of pagans and "heretics" aroused distrust, and he eventually became the victim of the in the Pope Hilarus, Emperor Anthemius 299

West all-powerful emperor-maker Rikimer (p. 315), who felt his position of power was threatened. Rikimer elevated the senator Flavius Anicius Olybrius (the husband of Placidia, the daughter of Valentinian III) to Augustus in 472 and conquered Rome after five months of civil war. A mob of noisy Christian Teutons of the Arian faith rolled into the city on xi. July robbing and murdering through the city plagued by hunger and plague. According to an old report, but again the sources are not consistent, they spared only the Vatican area, already full of monasteries and churches, as well as St. Peter, Anthemius in any case cut to pieces in a street fight in the church of St. Chrysogonus. But the very next month, in mid-August, Rikimer himself died (and was buried in the church of St. Agata in Subura, built or renewed by him). He was succeeded only a few weeks later by Olybrius, both victims of the plague.²⁸

Since Emperor Leo also died in Constantinople in early 474, further interference was not possible in the West, where a new break with Geiseric had occurred earlier. In the East, however, the religious ruckus shook the empire to such an extent that the two following regents more or less accommodated the Monophysites - under stage-ripe political grotesques.

Leo I had appointed his grandson, the son of Zeno, as co-ruler and successor in 473. After Leo's death on 18 Jan.

300 The war in the churches and for the churches'

Origin. He sent out against Zenon his relative, another Isaurian robber chief, Illos, an Orthodox Christian, whom he bribed by great promises. But instead of eliminating Zenon, Illos, already working for him earlier, went over to him again and, alongside the patriarch Akakios, worked for Zenon's comeback. Still at the end of August 476, the latter also regained power, not through war - he was already running away from Basilisko's commander (the empress's declared lover, a galan known to the city) - but through gifts and promises. And he kept this power also despite his unpopularity among the people and in senatorial circles, despite incessant civil wars, while he had the usurper Basiliskos

eliminated together with his wife and son, and his compatriots, who had returned with him, were doing worse than before.²⁹

The political turmoil, however, increased and complicated the religious ones.

Emperor Basiliskos, who died of starvation with his family in a dry cistern of Asia Minor, had tried to support his rule by a strict Monophysite policy after the rebellion against Zeno. Under the influence of the Alexandrian patriarch Timotheos Ailuros, who had re-entered after sixteen years of exile, he simply revoked the decrees of Chalcedon as well as the Tomus of Leo, imposing a ban on them because they only brought discord and

dissension. To all who would not sign the new decree, the so-called Encyclion (preserved in two different versions), he threatened the application of the "heretical" laws of Constantine and Theodosius II – and more than half a thousand bishops instantly signed this "heretical" creed! It was the first "decree of faith" issued by an emperor without a synod! Shortly before, under Emperor Leo I, most of these bishops had professed the Chalcedonense, i.e. in the opposite sense ... ³⁰

Theologians are never embarrassed; they know no shame.

Pope Simplicius courts usurper Basiliskos ³⁰¹

Timotheos Ailuros triumphed, yet now, enthusiastically received in Alexandria after a long exile, he returned to the fold, admittedly taking a moderate tack. And in Antioch, after Alexandria and Jerusalem a new trouble spot, Peter Fullo (Peter Gnapheus, "the Walker"), a Monophysite monk, came to the bishop's throne; he, too, for the second time. He had already ousted the Catholic Patriarch Martyrios (459–471), but Emperor Leo deposed him in 471, arrested him, deported him to Egypt and finally put him in the super-orthodox Akoimetes monastery near Constantinople. But Peter Fullo, to look ahead only briefly, succeeded a third time, from 485 to 488, in returning to the coveted see of Antioch, once a stronghold of Orthodoxy, and now even to die as patriarch – though not without his ousting, John of Apamea, whom he himself had appointed bishop, also being quickly removed beforehand, then his successor, the Chalcedonian Stephanos II. (477–479), fell in a street fight, then his successor Stephanos III died after a few years, and finally his successor Kalandion was also expelled.³¹

"The Old Church has become fashionable," exults Frits van der Meer today, "because there is renewed awareness that water springs loudest near its source." ³²

Pope Simplicius courts usurper Basiliskos and Emperor Zeno

Meanwhile, in Rome, Hilarus had been succeeded by Simplicius (468–483). And the new pope, who again made Oriental politics the main matter of his office, flattered the usurper no less submissively than a legal ruler, i.e. he behaved like innumerable other popes in such cases.

"Already when I look at the veneration with which I have always been

³⁰² The war in the churches and around the churches

Christian emperors," he began an agitational homage on 10 January 476, "I cherish the desire to give expression to this feeling, which obliges me, in uninterrupted correspondence with you." Simplicius spoke of his "most subservient," his "loving devotion to your majesty," his duty to "greet you, most glorious and gracious son and exalted emperor, in a befitting manner." Then, however, he castigated "the robberies of the false teachers" in the East, especially the "bishop-murderer Timothy," since he had "blown up anew the fire of the former frenzy," had "gathered together a bunch of degenerate people" – after all, all Christians! – "and seized anew the church of Alexandria, which he had earlier defiled with episcopal blood, and we hear that the blood man has also expelled the present rightful bishop ...

My spirit, venerable Emperor, shudders when I consider all the crimes this <gladiator> has committed. But even more, I confess it openly, it has horrified me that all this could happen, so to speak, under the eyes of Your Majesty. Who does not know or who doubts" – and now he again strokes the usurper's beard – "the sincerely pious mind of Your Majesty and your devotion to the right of the true faith? Has

it not been the heavenly providence that, for the salvation of the state, you have grown up on the virtuous example of the two emperors Marcian and Leo, that you have been guided by them to intimate sympathy with Catholic truth, so that no one dares to doubt that you succeed in fidelity to the faith those whose successors in the imperial dignity you are? And after having explained to Basiliscus, of course, that "among all the affairs of the empire, the pious ruler must first of all take care of that which protects his dominion," that therefore "the right fulfillment of the duties towards heaven must be placed before all other things," "without whom nothing can have right permanence," he implored him "urgently with the voice of the blessed Apostle Peter (beati Petri apostoli voce), of which also Pope Simplicius courts usurper Basiliskos 303

whatever I may be as minister of my chair: do not let the enemies of the ancient faith go about their business with impunity, if you want your own enemies to remain subject to you ... Do not allow the faith, our only hope of salvation, to be violated in any way, if you want God to favor you and your state.

God be merciful to you and your state".³³

So, once again, the ruler had to protect the true Catholic faith and remove Ailuros, who was not only a murderer, but stood lower than Cain, an "antichristus" and "divini culminis usurper," while the imperial usurper could also be celebrated by the pope as a "christianissimus princeps." Really, the enkyklion, which made Monophysitism an imperial creed but immediately provoked the determined opposition of Akakios (472-489), Patriarch of Constantinople, who conspired with Zeno, a pre-eminent politician who increasingly became the focus of Roman attacks, was formally withdrawn again by an antienkyklion. At the same time Akakios, who was probably the first bishop of the capital to be addressed with the title "ecumenical patriarch" (universalis patriarcha), also coolly ignoring the *referre ad sedem apostolicam*, certainly had more than the preservation of the "right" faith in mind, namely the maintenance of his patriarchal claim, the sovereign rights of his *thronos*, the validity of the canon 28. That is why he even had the stylite Daniel, frenetically adored by the masses, summoned down from his column at Anaplous near Constantinople and sent with a huge crowd against Basiliskos escaping to his palace outside the city - a cleverly arranged demonstration, as successful for the patriarch as it was embarrassing for the emperor. "The enemy of the Holy Church was brought to his knees," exulted the *Vita S. Danielis Stylitae*. Basiliskos was more afraid of Zeno, who, militarily superior, had already counterattacked in the mountains of Isauria. Thus, after a few months, Basiliskos revoked the "decree of faith" (certainly in a tortuous form that betrayed his reluctance) and, in a new decree, summarily confessed the opposite:

304 The war in the churches and for the churches.

"that the apostolic and orthodox faith ... alone remain in force unharmed and unshaken, and reign forever in all the Catholic and apostolic churches of the orthodox-" But the usurper, however unpopular Zeno was with the people, was swept away at the end of August 476. It was considered more a punishment from heaven than a success for the returning emperor, with crowds of prelates soon flocking to pay homage to him. "What a turn of events by the hand of the Most High!" now also immediately exulted Pope Simplicius, demanding again and again the deposition and banishment of his opponents in the East, of Paul of Ephesus, Peter Fullo, Timotheos Ailuros and many others, demanding that now with God's help he expel the "tyrants of the Church", demanding "an exile without return" (*ad inremediabile ... exilium*). Immediately the pope now completely adjusted himself to the new situation. He pretended - a clumsy, through the centuries until the post-Nazi period continuing *Pfaffenbluff* - as if he had never contacted the expelled Basiliskos (first his "glorious and most gracious son and exalted emperor", the "christianissimus princeps", then the "tyrant"; for successor Felix III: the "heretical tyrant"!) He acted as if he had not courted Basiliskos' favor as he does now for Zeno's. As if he

had not reminded Basiliskos as much of his great models Marcian and Leo I as he now reminded Zenon of them! The papal epistle "drips, as it were, with unctuous servility, with submissive flattery and effusive praise for the emperor" (Ullmann).

Zeno had at first pleased the Roman immensely by an orthodox confession of faith, also at his insistence decreed the banishment of Timotheos Ailuros, which admittedly prevented his death on July 31, 477, just when he was to be led away; it was said that he had poisoned himself. His monophysite archdeacon and successor, Petros III Mongos, was able to hold the patriarchal chair for only 36 days. Then a monk opposition recaptured it from the Catholic Salophakiolos, bloody fights broke out in the city and Petros Mongos was sentenced to deportation,

The Henotikon - a religious unification attempt 305

unseizable, had gone into hiding. Alexandria now had two patriarchs: one who was seen but not respected; and one who was respected but not seen.

Zeno, meanwhile, who had regained power in Constantinople with the help of Orthodoxy and Akakios, understandably cared more for his city of residence than for Rome or even for its servile bishop, and soon decreed plainly enough: "the church of Constantinople is the mother of our own piety and of all right-believing Christians, and this most holy see of our city shall rightfully have for all time all the privileges and honors as to the consecration rights of bishops and precedence over all others as they were recognized before our accession to power." At the same time, Zeno sought to mediate between the two contending ecclesiastical parties by issuing a decree of union, a formal edict of faith, in letter form to the Christians of Alexandria, Egypt, Libya, and the Pentapolis in 482.^{3*}

The Henotikon - a religious unification attempt, opposed by Rome, divides empire and Christendom even deeper

The Henotikon (the "unification" formula: a term derived from vulgar language, which the noble papacy never called by its name even later) was the masterful work of Patriarch Akakios

and his friend Petros Mongos, a typical expression of imperial church thought, the attempt at a balance between Catholics and Monophysites, which, however, soon divided them even more deeply. The henoticon wanted to reconcile Monophysites and Diophysites in the interest of imperial unity, the prerequisite for which was the unity of faith, but above all to pacify Egypt and Syria in terms of religious policy and to consolidate the state as a whole, all the more necessary as the emperor was beset by Ostrogoths and rebellious generals like Illos.

306 The war in and around the churches

The Henotikon was not formally heretical. It based itself on the confessions of the councils of Nicaea (325) and Constantinople (381). It retained the unity of Jesus and his consubstantiality with the "Father" as well as the catchword "Mother of God", Cyril's Christology of the "Twelve Anathematisms", the condemnation of both the "heretic" Eutyches and the "heretic" Nestorios - Zeno had the school of the Nestorians of Edessa completely destroyed in 489. In contrast, the Henotikon passed over many a controversial issue. It avoided all kinds of dogmatic complications, certain formulations of Chalcedon, whose statutes it ignored, especially the precarious, even dangerous terms "person" and "nature".

Ignoring, therefore, the point actually in dispute (one or two natures: of Christ it was said only that he was "One, and not two"), Emperor Zeno, by all means a devout Christian, wanted to win the Monophysites for the imperial Church, to unify the contending clergy on a middle line, and thus to secure for the Empire a unified cult and religious peace. "Whoever thinks or thought otherwise, then, now, or ever, whether at Chalcedon or elsewhere at a synod, we say anathema!" Just as radically, indeed more resolutely, a century earlier another emperor, Theodosius I, had inculcated the Orthodox faith on February 28, 380 (1419 f).^{3S}

Like the bloody oppressions, however, the peaceful attempt at reconciliation brought no unity. The

henoticon satisfied neither the Orthodox nor the Monophysites. The individual bishops acted as they pleased, writes Euagrios of Antioch (incidentally: the one among all ancient church historians who had the highest state titles). The Christian opponents "no longer held fellowship with one another. Therefore there were many divisions in East and West and Africa ... The matter became even more absurd. For even the Oriental bishops held no communion among themselves." Even in the East, where the henoticon was held by the Monophysite patriarchs of Alexandria, Petros Mongos, the "stammerer", Timotheos' most important follower, and Antio

The Henotikon - an Attempt at Religious Unification 307

chia, Petrus Fullo, had been signed, also by Martyrius of Jerusalem and other prelates, at least four sharply rival Christian major groups: one for Chalcedon without Henotikon; one for Chalcedon and Henotikon; one against Chalcedon and for Henotikon; one against Chalcedon and Henotikon. Yes, there were always new schisms, the Severians, Juliani'-sts, Agnoetes, Actists, Ktistolatrae, Trities, Damianists, Cononites, Niobites, et cetera, all spreading more or less or quite contrary doctrines about Christ's nature and the resurrection of the human body. Not even all Mono-physites accepted the henoticon, as did the extremist direction of the Akephaloi.³⁶

Nevertheless, the Edictum Zenonis, as it was originally called, probably would have gradually pacified the bitter church struggle in the East, had it not been externally fomented by the bishop of Rome. The Henotikon, a purely imperial declaration of faith, had bypassed him outright, had not asked him at all. Also, precisely his fiercest rival, Patriarch Akakios of Constantinople, who from the beginning had sought a middle line, a certain balance between Chalcedonians and Monophysites, encouraged, indeed directed, the mediation efforts of the governments. Moreover, the papacy fundamentally rejected any kind of compromise solution in dogmatic matters and, as always, pretended to be principled. And finally, Rome adhered to the decisions of Chalcedon all the more because the Roman Church itself had been allowed to have a say in them, for the first time ever at one of the great imperial synods. "All decisions before that had been made without their input solely by bishops and theologians of the Eastern Church" (Dannenbauer).³⁷

Thus, quite unlike his predecessor Hilarus, Pope Simplicius took up the tradition of Leo I again - admittedly much more clumsily. Only no mediation, certainly not if it was at the expense of his universal claim.

Incessantly, he called the Orient to "heretic" war, using Akakios, an eminently political head far superior to him,

308 The war in and around the churches as misjudged as the emperor, also on his part hardly taken very seriously by either, often rather ignored. Again and again he urged Akakios to obtain from the sovereign the banishment of the "heretics" into an inaccessible exile, to have them excluded from the human association by a special imperial decree, to segregate them as in the case of an infectious disease, To exclude them from human society by a special imperial decree, as if they were infected with a contagious disease, to deny them any possibility of satisfaction, to take Petros Mongos, "the journeyman and prince of the heretics", out of his hiding place and put him in a distant country. Any flare-up of heresy must be made impossible. There must be no peace. Incessantly, the patriarch should ask the monarch, whether convenient or not, for the use of state power to protect Catholicism.³⁸

The imperial "heretic" denial seemed too weak to Simplicius. He also disliked the fact that Zeno's court patriarch ordained the patriarch of Antioch, who was independent of Constantinople, in which he saw an inadmissible increase in Akakios' power. And when even in Alexandria the recently appointed Timotheos Salophakiolos died in February 482, the Catholics elected the monk John Talaja, but the emperor and Akakios instead of the perjured high traitor the old friend of Timotheos Ailuros, the schismatic bishop Petros Mongos, the "socius haereticorum" expelled from the Catholic Church, as

Pope Simplicius wrote to Akakios, the propagator of militant "heresies", as he wrote to the emperor (neither answered: "nullum responsum," as successor Felix registers in measured amazement), then the quarrel with Rome broke out openly. 39

The Acacian Schism begins in 309

The Acacian Schism Begins -

AND ECCLESIASTICAL TREASON

The bishops of the East agreed with those of the West, especially with the Roman bishops, in an interest that separated them most of all: power politics, which is always also and above all personnel politics. The Catholic "Handbook of Church History" correctly states that the inextricable confusion of the Eastern Church "could not be solved with formulas, because it had not arisen from formulas, but that it was necessary to deal with the personalities" (Beck). But that means: with personal, with power-political interests, which had long and increasingly become intertwined with those of "big" politics, which made the contradictions all the more intricate.⁴⁰

Emperor Zeno, while still pursuing Orthodox church policy, had deposed Petros Mongos, but had not decreed his banishment, despite repeated efforts by the pope. Now, when he was concerned with mediation, reconciliation, and winning over his Monophysite subjects, he could use Petros again and reinstated him after the death of Salophakiolos in February 482. Yes, precisely that moderate unification formula, the Henotikon, with which the emperor sought to settle the clerical dispute and to achieve the unity of the Oriental church under his leadership, had been worked out by Petros Mongos (482 to 490), a brash, determined head, together with the patriarch Akakios.⁴¹

The pope's candidate, however, had been John I Talaja. The latter, of course, had once had to swear an oath to the emperor before the patriarch and the senate never to become a bishop because of his connection with the Isaurian Illos. After the death of Timotheos Salophakiolos, however, John Talaja immediately had himself ordained as successor in Alexandria under breach of oath. Outraged, Zeno deposed him and Petros Mongos came in his place. And while Talaja's monks accepted the new patriarch, who was a Monophysite, nevertheless the Henotikon

had branded the new patriarch, who was a monophysite, as a "heretic," Talaja himself turned to Illos,

the imperial general who had long been influential at the court, just as he was plotting insurrection against the emperor. The military had already joined forces with the Catholic patriarch Calandion in Antioch against Zeno and also sought contact with Odoacer, the Germanic ruler in Italy with whom Pope Simplicius was already negotiating. So Talaja fled via Antioch, where Illos was staying, to whom he had already "given rich gifts" as administrator of the Alexandrian church (Bacht SJ). And from Illos he fled on in 483 to the Pope, to whom he had appealed, advised by Illos and the Patriarch of Antioch. Shortly before his arrival, Pope Simplicius dies after a long illness (March 10, 483), but his successor, Felix, apparently elected under Odoacer's pressure, now fiercely attacks the emperor. And this happens at the same time as in Asia Illos rebels against him, on whose side is also the Patriarch of Antioch, the ally of John Talaja and the Pope!⁴²

Pope Felix III (483-492.) - he is called the third, although Felix II. He was the first pope to come from Roman nobility. He was also the first pope to begin his ministry after the collapse of the Western Roman Empire, perhaps as a candidate of Odoacer, in any case immediately ready to cooperate with the new Germanic

masters, or at least to pretend to do so. Married before his clerical career, St. Felix had a number of children, was also himself the son of a priest, and (presumably) the great-grandfather of Pope Gregory I ("the Great").⁴³

After John Talaja's intervention, the new Roman prince of the Church protested. He appeared decidedly

more forceful in everything than his somewhat weakly servile predecessor. Though unversed in curial business, he had a well-functioning chancery headed by Gelasius, later pope. As late as 483, Felix sent an envoy, the bishops Vitalis of Troento and Misenus of Cumae, to Byzantium and presented the Council of Chalcedon to Emperor Zeno, without directly attacking the Henoticon.

The Council of Chalcedon was presented as the "right middle road", while Zeno saw the right middle road in the Henotikon. In vain, too, Felix in another letter – a refined mixture of arrogance, barely concealed acrimony, and appropriate biblical sayings – urged Akakios to "hasten to answer" in Rome "before St. Peter" and his synod. Akakios, who energetically expanded his position of power, did not think of it. He was about equal in rank to the Roman in terms of imperial ecclesiastical law, but felt himself considerably superior to him as "pope" of the East, rather than equal. In fact, the Roman bishops, despite ever more rabid polemics, struggles of principle, pretensions legally, factually, in some respects even spiritually, were quite powerless, almost a quantite negligeable, at least vis-à-vis the lords of Constantinople. Thus Akakios had the Roman's legates, the bishops Vitalis and Misenus, imprisoned and bribed as soon as they landed at Abydos, whereupon they shamefully fell down and even attended a mass celebrated by the patriarch in Constantinople. The pope, however, had Akakios, "who imprisoned me in my own," deposed, excommunicated and irrevocably cursed by a Roman synod on July 28, 484, as well as any bishop, cleric, monk or layman who consorted with him – the first great schism between East and West. "God" had expelled Akakios, Felix declared in his solemn entreaty of banishment, "from the episcopate by a decree issued from heaven." "Know that you are excluded from the episcopal dignity as well as from the Catholic community and the number of the faithful, condemned by the judgment of the Holy Spirit and our apostolic authority, and never again to be released from the bonds of anathema."

The Roman Synod's sentence of deposition, signed by the pope and 77 bishops who attended, was taken by Defensor Tutus to Constantinople. (According to one questionable version, monks of the opposition, the Akoimetes monastery loyal to Rome, pinned the bull of excommunication to the archbishop's pallium during Sunday service, whereupon his entourage

3iz The war in the churches and around the churches

bungalow has partly slain them, partly imprisoned them). The Defensor ecclesiae Tutus, however, was also pressured and bribed and fired by the pope, as were the legates Vitalis and Misenus. In solemn mass they had communicated with Akakios and also recognized the Monophysite Patriarch of Alexandria, Petros Mongos. It was not until eleven years later that Pope Gelasius I reinstated the misenus, since one could not risk letting the penitent die through old age or illness without peace with the Church. The other legate, Vitalis, of course, had already died.... **

At that time St. Felix III wrote to the Emperor. Felix III, already at the beginning very much fearing for the "salvation" of the sovereign and at the end again invoking "God's judgment seat", wrote to the emperor in a hitherto unheard of, equally urgently sharp as cuttngly cold tone, quite obviously going back to the chancellor Gelasius, that the emperor in God's affairs is to subordinate his will to the bishops of Christ (subdere), that he had to learn from them, not to teach them, that he did not have to play the Lord, but to follow the Church, since God wanted "that Your Majesty bend the neck of this Church in pious devotion" – the papal claim to rule of centuries to come, a sentence that recurs in many ecclesiastical legal collections. Neither the regent, to whom the loyalty of Egypt and Syria was more important than the applause of Rome, nor. Patriarch Akakios, who calmly crossed out of the diptychs the name of the Pope – who called him "serpent", "boil", "cancerous" – symbolizing his exclusion from the Church, cared in the least about the opinion of Felix, which is why the Roman Synod of October 5, 485 lamented that "our pearls are thrown before swine and dogs ... Satan is overcome and yet he continues to work". All three patriarchs had now been deposed and excommunicated by the pope,

invoking a customary law supposedly long practiced in Italy. A 35-year schism (484–519) between Rome and Constantinople was the result.⁴⁵

One has to read this hardly believable highfalutin passage in the context of the

The Acacian Schism Begins in 313

context to appreciate what the Roman priesthood, which was gradually becoming more and more swindled, already allowed itself to do to an emperor when he did not want it as it wanted. "This one thing is certain," wrote Felix (Gelasius): "It is most salutary also for your own legal sphere if you endeavor, in all matters concerning God, to bend (subdere) your imperial will under the bishops of Christ, as God's law requires, and not to stretch (prae-ferre) beyond them. The sacred mysteries you have not to teach, but to learn from their administrators. You have to follow the firmly established claim of the church, but not to prescribe purely human legal norms to the church. You must not wish to dominate the sacred institutions of the Church, for God Himself has willed that Your Majesty should bow the neck of this Church in devotion.

Rome never denied the orthodoxy of the henoticon.

Significantly, the papal epistle to the emperor also lacks any discussion of the Monophysite or Diophysite strife. For here again it was basically not a matter of faith, but of prestige, of power. Without this contest "between the two popes of Old and New Rome, the 35 years of strife between the churches of the East and West, which began with Felix III, would probably not have broken out at all" (Haller). At issue was Constantinople's claim to leadership. Rome wanted the dispute, brought it about on purpose, by hook or by crook. It acted against the emperor and the patriarch as arrogantly as never before. It afforded itself this courage only under the protection of two Germanic "heretics", first Odoacer, then Theoderic. Rome rejected all attempts of the emperor to communicate with her, and even joined forces with troops that rebelled against him!^{*7}

It happened through that Illos, who once went out under the usurper Basiliskos to destroy the dethroned Zenon, but brought him back with him to the throne (p. 300). Illos, like Zenon an Isaurian and promoted to general by him, was admittedly appointed as an advisor alongside the returned Maje 314 The war in the churches and around the church

stāt as a result of three assassination attempts (477, 478 and 481) – in the third assassination attempt he lost an ear, but managed to escape again – of his life not happy, even if Zenon denied any involvement, indeed, each time expressed his lively sympathy to the still living. They did not dare to fight openly for a long time and behaved as if they were "still brigand chiefs in their native mountains" (Schwartz). Illos grew too hot to serve at Zenon's side. He had himself given a command in Syria and had the empress dowager Verina elevate the general Leontius to counter-emperor in 484.⁴⁸

In league with Illos, however, was also the Chalcedonian opposition. First, the counter-bishop John Talaiah in Alexandria, whom Emperor Zeno declared a perjured high traitor (periurii reum) and guilty of every outrage. Talaja had established close relations with Illos and later with the co-conspirator exarch of Egypt, and had finally fled to Rome, as Athanasius had once done, where he conspired against the emperor and the pope made a break with Constantinople. Shortly after, the strictly Catholic Kalandion, bishop of Antioch, where counter-emperor Leontius resided, also joined Illos, but after defeating Leontius, whose reign lasted only two months, he was banished as a high traitor. Illos had also sought to involve the Germanic usurper in Italy, King Odoacer, in the conspiracy, albeit in vain, but was defeated, along with his counter-emperor, delivered to Zeno and executed in 488. Soon, however, Odoacer also declared himself independent of the emperor and joined forces with the Vandals in Africa.⁴⁹

The papacy now gradually undertook one opportunistic pivot of world-historical proportions after another. And while its victims fall by the wayside, it itself grows ever larger and stronger. First it turns with the Goths against Eastern Rome. Then, together with Ostrom, it destroys the Goths and the

Vandals. After that, it stands again on the side of the Lombards against Ostrom. And finally, after having gained "freedom", it fights with the Franks the Lombards, its liberators. – Only the Acacian schism begins 315 first and second act of this shameless spectacle we can still follow in this volume.

In the West, where totally disrupted, chaotic, yet very useful to the popes conditions prevailed, after Valentinian III, one shadow emperor replaced another, a total of nine in two decades. Probably six of them were assassinated, including, after barely four years of rule, Majorian on the Ira in August 461 and, on July 11, 472, Anthemius in Rome (pp. 298 f). Executioner's axes and poison raged. The reins were held by the army commander and "emperor-maker" Rikimer, who, more powerful than Stilicho and even Aetius, had prepared the Germanic kingship in Italy, but as an Arian offspring of a Suebian prince and a daughter of the Visigoth king Wallia could not yet hope to rule himself. After the last of the Western Roman shadow figures, the child emperor Romulus Augustus, a fourteen-year-old boy, had been dethroned in 476 by the Skiren Odoacer – whose father Edeco had a prominent position in Attila's army – and had been settled with a pension, Odoacer, as the first Germanic king of Italy (476–493), commanded the whole country; to what extent recognized by Eastern Rome is disputed. Odoacer killed the father of Emperor Romulus, Orestes, once Attila's secretary, and Orestes' brother, Paulus, on August 28 and September 4. The emperor Julius Nepos, who fled in 475, protested in Dalmatia for four more years until he was assassinated in his country house near Salona in May 480. The Western Roman Empire had come to an end, perished, according to Edward Gibbon in his monumental work *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, by the "triumph of religion and barbarism."/0

316 The war in the churches and for the churches

Theoderic conquers Italy or "Where is God?"

The legal successor, however, of the Empire became Eastern Rome. The latent conflict between the western and eastern parts of the empire had steadily intensified over time, and the old papal tactic of playing off the western regent against the eastern one had failed since the death of Valentinian III. Also, Eastern Rome prevailed against the Germanic tribes in domestic and foreign policy. Just as Emperor Zeno succeeded in keeping his throne, which was always endangered, through the "most unconditional diplomatic fencing game of all times" (Rubin), not least because he was able to divert the Ostrogoths, who were threatening the Eastern Roman Empire, to Italy.⁵¹

The Ostrogoths, subdued in 375 by the onrushing Huns (cf. I 405 ff), had come into the Hungarian Danube basin at the beginning of the 5th century and – after Attila's death (453) and the rapid decline of his seemingly unbeatable giant empire – under Roman suzerainty. They now settled in Pannonia, in the area of Lake Balaton. Here, around the middle of the 5th century, Theoderic (the Dietrich of Bern of legend) was born as the son of King Thiudimer of the house of the Amalians and was probably baptized Arian as a child. However, the sources are almost completely silent about his origin and youth, as well as about the first years of his reign. At the age of seven, Theoderic came as a hostage to Constantinople, where he remained for eleven years, apparently in the immediate vicinity of Emperor Leo. There he had studied Latin and Greek, learned to appreciate ancient culture, became acquainted with political and military conditions, and married an imperial princess.

Theoderic's most dangerous Ostrogothic rival was Theoderic Strabo. For years Zenon played the two distantly related princes off against each other, but they also united against the emperor on several occasions. In the coup of Basiliskos in 475, Theoderic the Amalian took sides with Zenon, while Theoderic Strabo, the elder of the two, joined the usurper, stripped of all honors in 476, but then in all Theoderic Conquers Italy or "Where is God?" 317 offices and dignities. But in 481 he succumbed to a wound he had accidentally inflicted on himself. The two Strabo brothers, now in joint leadership with his son Rekitach, were murdered soon after. And in 484 Theoderic single-handedly struck down a

cousin, with Zeno's knowledge, in Constantinople.⁵²

Since, despite the Amaler's high honors – patrician (476), friend of the emperor, consul (484) – there was always friction between him and the regent, including devastating moves by Theoderic through Thrace because the desolate land on the lower Danube no longer fed his people, Zenon formally charged him with a move against Odoacer, the "ruler of violence" (Prokop).⁵³

Odoacer was Skire or Rugian, in any case Germanic and Arian Christian. Elevated to king on August 23, 476, without ever wearing a purple cloak or diadem, he ruled Italy from the Alps to Etna for thirteen years; Geiseric had ceded Sicily to him in 477 in return for a tribute. Later, when Odoacer threatened to invade the Eastern Empire, where Theoderic had devastated Thrace and Illos had rebelled, the emperor was in distress and resorted to the time-tested means of eliminating Germanic tribes by Germanic tribes by inciting the Rugians to invade Italy. Odoacer, however, beat them to it and in 487 and 488 destroyed their land (in what is now Lower Austria on the left bank of the Danube) in two campaigns, annihilating their rule and most of their people – a war not only between two Germanic tribes but, since the Rugians were also Arians, between two Christian ones. Zeno, however, reconciled with Theoderic again, threw down Illos in 488, had him beheaded, and that same year sent the Ostrogoth king against Odoacer, whom he had regarded as a usurper, a tyrant, and had only reluctantly tolerated as governor. To Theoderic, Zeno, a "master in the use of political relations," as Prokop notes, held out the prospect of "winning the whole of the West for himself and his Goths after the defeat of Odoacer; for him, who belonged to the Roman Senate, it would be more worthy,

318 The War in the Churches and for the Churches to defeat a tyrant and then to command Rome and Italy than to engage in the dangerous struggle with the emperor. Theoderic was delighted with this proposal and set out for Italy, with him all the people of the Goths. "⁵⁴

This happened in the fall of 488.

Theoderic set out from Moesia with his warriors, their wives, children, but by no means with the whole people, some of whom remained in the Balkans. Instead, groups of other origins participated, perhaps a total of 100,000, perhaps 200,000 people, but probably much less and in any case less than Rome had inhabitants at that time. "A whole world," writes a contemporary, the bishop Ennodius of Pavia, "came drawn near, chariots served them instead of houses, and into wandering tents they gathered all they could reach." These Goths, of course, it must be remembered, were also Christians. Already on the way, in Romania, they almost completely destroyed the Gepids, also Christians, who were related to them by tribe, but were hostile to them, after Theoderic, in an extremely critical situation, had placed himself at the head and, according to an old source, raged "like the torrent in the seed fields, like the lion in the herd". Then there was a four-year war, bitter, terribly devastating upper Italy, especially Liguria, and rich in vicissitudes, apostasy and treachery on both sides.

Theoderic first defeated Odoacer with a large army, also reinforced by other Germanic troops, in the summer and fall of 489 at the Isonzo and at Verona, where the Adige River was dammed by the mass of those killed. Afterwards Milan opened the gates to him, probably under the influence of the bishop Laurentius there, who had stood by the superior Theoderic since the beginning of the war (and under him probably became the most powerful prelate in Italy. The bishop of Ticinutn-Pavia, Epi-phanus, also sought out the Amalian in Milan). On xi. August 490 there was a severe battle at the Adda, where Theoderic, under- attacked by a Visigothic army of King Alaric II.

Theoderic Conquers Italy or "Where is God?" 319 supported, remained victorious a third time despite heavy losses. As before, the desperate Odoacer retreated to Ravenna, his last base. The Goths surrounded him and for two and a half years besieged the city, which was hardly accessible due to lagoons, swamps, earthen ramparts, one of the strongest, almost impregnable fortresses of that time – the "Battle of the Ravens" of legend. Neither the attackers were able to advance, nor the defenders to take the air by raids.

However, since the summer of 492, when the aggressor came into possession of ships in Ariminum, he was able to blockade Ravenna also from the sea. On February 25, 493, Archbishop John of Ravenna brokered a treaty whereby both kings would share rule over Italy. On February 26, the gates of Classis opened to Theoderic. On March 5, Archbishop John led him to Ravenna in solemn procession with crosses, smoke flags and chanting psalms. But a few days afterward, Theoderic invited Odoacer to join him in the Palast ad Lauretum, the imperial palace, and, since the commissioned assassins hesitated, he single-handedly stabbed his sixty-year-old defenseless Germanic partner – one Arian Christian to another Arian Christian – in breach of oath. "Where is God?" said Odoacer when the first sword blow struck him in the collarbone. And Theoderic, when his second blow split Odoacer in half: "This beast has not even a bone in his body". At the same time he exterminated Odoaker's family. He shot Odoacer's brother himself in a church with a bow. He had his son Thela first banished, then executed, and his wife Sunigilda condemned to starvation. Moreover, by order of the Amaler, Odoaker's troops and their relatives were completely murdered in all parts of the country.⁵⁵

Theoderic the Great!

He was now, under the supremacy of the Eastern Roman emperor, the sole master of Italy. And this bloodthirsty victor, the successful student of Christian slaughter, who had organized a slaughter vividly reminiscent of the ghastly bloodbath after Constantine's death (I 306 ff), who as ruler also

j2o The war in the churches and around the churches

phrases such as "our pious grace" (pietas), "our providence" (providentia), certainly felt himself to be a king by God's grace. Just as Constantius II, the "first representative of God's grace" (Seeck), despite his extensive massacre of relatives, could feel himself to be a particularly God-sent ruler, a "bishop of bishops" and declare: "Always we want to boast in faith ..." Theoderic, the Germanic king by God's grace, now said: "to our power is

subject, with God's gracious assistance, all that we will." Or: "we rule with God's help". He had Arian churches maintained everywhere, erected in Ravenna itself, right next to his residence, a church dedicated to St. Martin, restored also the Basilica Herculis – and yet, at least at that time (and thus in general), he had been "robber and murderer", and one "of the greatest style" (de Ferdinandy).⁵⁶

The Goths of his time were federates, not Roman citizens. Soldiers, however, could only be Goths.

Romans were barred from military service; except, apparently, for some warlike tribes in the borderlands. But like the Catholic Romans, the Arian Goths were not deterred from war by their Christianity. On the contrary. They are said to have taken the ecclesiastical regulations quite seriously, and Theoderic himself prepared himself for a tour of arms by prayer and penance. In his mobilization order for the campaign in Gaul it was written: "the Goths must be told to fight more than they must be persuaded to do so, because a warlike race takes pleasure (gaudium) in proving itself". (Also Gundobad, the pious king of the Burgundians, whose princes were very devoted to the bishop of Rome, had indeed taken advantage of the conflict between the tearing Christian Germanic tribes, had undertaken a raid to Liguria and had carried away many prisoners)⁵⁷.

Soon after Theoderic's victory, a large part of central and southern Italy, especially the city of Rome, which had already closed its gates to the declining Odoacer, but also Sicily, declared itself in favor of the king, whose Ostrogothic empire stretched from Hungary to southern Galicia.

Collaboration with the "heretical" occupying power in 321 lia and the former Roman provinces north of the Alps, yet was to last only sixty years and be finally destroyed by the Battle of Vesuvius in 553 (p. 437). The narrower Gothic settlement area included Samnium, Picenum, northern Tuscia, the Aemilia, Venetia and especially the land north of the Po. More scattered, the Goths settled in Dalmatia, Istria, Savia, Pannonia. In foreign policy, Theoderic gained a leading position through alliances with all Germanic states. He married the sister of the Merovingian Clovis, gave his daughters to the kings of the

Visigoths and the Vandals, and his niece to the king of the Thuringians as wife.

Collaboration with the "heretic" occupying power

When the Amalian invaded Italy, there was a schism between East and West since the Henotikon, that is, enmity between Constantinople and the Pope. This was the intention of the Goths, who were more interested in their own influence in Rome than in that of the Eastern emperor. In fact, Constantinople itself blamed the difficulty of coming to terms with Theoderic on the ecclesiastical schism. Perhaps less out of fundamental tolerance than out of political calculation, the Amalian pursued a Catholic-friendly policy. But the Arian rulers of both the Visigoths and especially the Ostrogoths were generally largely tolerant, without any proselytizing frenzy. The Romans were not coerced into conversion. They themselves praised the Gothic magnanimity, which, of course, did not stem from Arianism, but was Germanic heritage, as the proverb shows: there is no harm in passing between a pagan altar and a church, and witnessing one's devotion to both. The Arian clergy, which did not live in celibacy up to the level of bishop, nor did it provide a home for monasticism, sought neither to influence its own government nor to

jzz The War in and around the Churches

he proselytized among his Catholic neighbors. No one could accuse the king himself of having ever turned a Catholic into an Arian, of having persecuted only a bishop. His mother Hereleva became a Catholic and was baptized Eusebia. Pope Gelasius was in contact with her, but for his part apparently did not want bishops to travel to the royal court without his placet. In Rome, where Theoderic first appeared in 500, received by the people, the Senate and, at the head of the priests, the Pope, he first went – three hundred years already before Charlemagne – to the Basilica of St. Peter to pray at the (alleged) tomb of the Apostles "with great devotion and like a Catholic" and to give St. Peter two silver candelabra weighing seventy pounds. He was also tolerant of the Jews, as apparently Odoacer had been. "For the sake of civilization," he said, "the benefits of justice are not to be withheld even from those who still err in faith." Or, "We cannot command a faith, because no one is forced to believe against his will." Several times he defended the Roman Jews against the clergy of Rome, where in 521 the Jewish synagogue, three hundred years older than St. Peter's, than the Lateran, was incinerated by Catholics; apparently an act of revenge for the punishment of some Christians who slew their Jewish masters. But the Romans had already repeatedly ravaged the synagogue, burning it down most recently under Theodosius. Christians also set fire to a synagogue in Ravenna. And it was Catholics who snatched Theodosius' body from the tomb and desecrated it. – For practicing pagans, however, the Goth, adopting the law of the emperors Marcian and Valentinian, retained the death penalty.⁵⁹

As king of Italy, Theoderic also exercised ecclesiastical sovereignty, not only general superintendence, but civil and criminal jurisdiction. Even the popes, who benefited from his rule and were able to increase their influence, recognized him as a legitimate regent. At the very least, they felt compelled to condemn "the almighty Arian king's

Collaboration with the "heretical" occupying power 323 to wear the mask of friendly disposition, but perhaps this only intensified their inner hatred" (Davidsohn). After all, the Italian Catholics in particular never came to terms with the fact that the Goths were "heretics".

After all, the popes, who had otherwise fought Arianism to the point of destruction, never rebelled against Arianism now that they themselves were ruled by Arians. Even the most important pope of the century after Leo I, Gela-sius, did not think of preaching against the "heretical" occupying power. Almost everywhere in Italy, Arian bishops officiated alongside Catholic ones. As in Ravenna, Arian churches stood in Rome, and no Catholic religious fighter touched them – while the synagogue could be burned down! But the Jews did not rule! One did not depend on them! Such respected Catholic bishops as Epiphanius of Pavia or Laurentius of Milan collaborated especially closely with the Amalian. And

Gelasius himself maintained rather submissive epistolary contacts with the "greatness" of Theoderic. Yes, in a legal transaction (concerning finances) with the Gothic count Teja, a man, as the pope wrote, nevertheless "without doubt of the other community", he could threaten him with his own "lord king, my son": "since in his wisdom he does not want to oppose ecclesiastical things in anything, it is right that whoever lives under his rule imitates the example of the great-powerful king, so as not to appear to proceed against his will". Just as Gelasius, with all his wild polemics against the oppositional Church of the East and Akakios, spared the emperor himself, even assuring him that "also" his predecessor Felix III had "not touched the imperial name in the least". And Gelasius himself praised "what pious zeal the mild majesty displayed in private life".⁶⁰

In the Orient, meanwhile, not only had Akakios died in November 489 and his chair been filled by Fravita, who died in the following March after a mere four-month reign, but in April 491 Zeno had also died. Pope Felix, who had died in the

314 DBR War in the churches and around the churches

February 492, passed away, had at last, as it were, coolly courted him, without concession, and made him out to be a victim of his unfit patriarch. Empress Dowager Ariadne now associated herself with a court official of more mature age who had risen under Zeno and had been a candidate for the patriarchal chair of Antioch as recently as three years earlier, after Peter Fullo's death, but now became emperor: Anastasios I (491–518).⁶¹

Emperor Anastasios and Pope Gelasius TRETEN INTO THE RING.

Anastasios, at his election by the Patriarch of Constantinople, Euphemios (490–496), explicitly committed to support Orthodoxy, to the Confession of Chalcedon, soon defended Zenon's henoticon. He favored, personally thoroughly pious, which even the new pope Gelasius I admitted, the later Monophysite patriarch Severos (512,–518) of Antioch, a "man of genius" (Bacht SJ), who was as highly educated as successful, and who was a guest at the imperial court from 508 to 511. Yes, gradually the emperor sided completely with the Monophysites. Already before his elevation to the throne he would have preached for them from time to time and was seriously discussed as successor of Peter Fullo. The ruler's advocacy of the Monophysites, however, drove Catholics, especially in Asia Minor and the Balkans, to indignation, especially since Anastasios I was also a rigorous fiscal politician. However, his corresponding measures were judged very differently, especially positively by Prokop and the learned John Lydos. After all, the monarch was able to consolidate the coinage system and to rehabilitate the state finances through a fundamental renewal of the tax system, through a very frugal and still relatively humane administration. He was even the only late Roman emperor who ever abolished a tax, the chrysargyron, a gold tax that burdened the cities, which benefited the lower classes.

Emperor Anastasios and Pope Gelasius enter the ring 315

came. In the process, he left no debts to the treasury at his death, but 32,0000 pounds of gold. Ergo, in Catholic terms: "Gold thirst and heresy stained his government and his name" (Wetzer/Welte).

Emperor

Anastasios did not erect any ostentatious buildings, as so many popes did, but all the more harbor facilities, water pipes and the like, as he also took energetic precautions against famine. And finally, under him there never happened "such savage persecutions as Justin and Justinian staged immediately after the abolition of the Henotikon ..., and when it seemed necessary to him to remove bishops, he strictly demanded that no blood be shed" (Schwartz). Thus, even to a theological opponent, he was "Anastasios, the good emperor, the friend of the monks, and the protector of the poor and unfortunate."

"62

Indes, not everyone he protected.

First, Anastasios "cleansed" the court of his predecessor's Isaurian compatriots. The latter's entire family

fled. Isauria itself was covered with a small war lasting for years, all opponents were captured and killed and whole parts of the people were deported to Thrace. Characteristic of this government, however, are defensive wars against the Persians, the old "hereditary enemy," and against the Bulgarians, remnants of the Huns, who had been strengthened by other Asiatic tribes and now became a new "hereditary enemy" for centuries – although this emperor, in stark contrast to his Catholic successors, "fundamentally avoided wars of aggression" (Rubin).⁶³

Incidentally, Anastasios I made common cause with the Monophysites.

Court patriarch Euphemios (490–496), a Syrian and rigorous Chalcedonian, distrusted the future emperor from the beginning; he knew his lay preaching. Thus, before Anastasios' coronation, he had the latter assure him on oath "that he would preserve the faith intact and not introduce any innovation into the holy Church of God"; the patriarch deposited the written "homology" in the church archives. He apparently kept it more with

32.6 The war in the churches and around the churches

Rome—where, however, Felix III and Gelasius I were not very accommodating—than with his oath-breaking Christian ruler. The court bishop managed to escape several assassination attempts, but apparently he also managed to establish contacts with the rebellious Isaurians, whom Anastasios had been fighting since he came to power. In 496 he had Euphemios deposed and excommunicated by a Constantinople synod for high treason, whereupon he was hounded into exile to Euchaita and his successor Makedonios (496–511) sworn to the Henotikon. In this way, of course, the monarch unleashed the intensified resistance of the Catholics and was repeatedly in danger of losing the throne. However, not only religious but also economic reasons played a role, which were often interrelated.⁶⁴

In Rome, Pope Felix III had died at the end of February 492. Already on March 1, Gelasius I (492–496) became his successor. As chancellor of the curia, he had written Felix's letters and already had considerable influence. And although he reigned only a few years, he put his stamp on them, enormously argumentative, full of verve, dialectical sharpness and intransigence, unmistakable, even formidable. Gladly ironically sarcastic, he also tended in his letters to prolixity, verbosity, convoluted periods, tapeworm sentences, to often purely rhetorical stylistic devices, but all in all he produced a skillful mixture of Roman jurisprudence and biblical sayings, rarely forgetting the threat of divine judgment. In short, this pontiff was diplomatically and juristically predestined for his post, was not only politically highly significant, but also the first truly educated theologian among Roman bishops for a quarter of a millennium, since Novatian (pp. 100 ff). The "born Roman" (Romanus natus), as he called himself, although he obviously came from North Africa, did not shy away from sophistry or naked lies, such as the assertion that Rome alone had ordered the Council of Chalcedon for the sake of truth (cf. p. 228 f). Or: since Christ no Christian emperor had arrogated to himself the title of a supreme priest. He also deduced from the

Emperor Anastasios and Pope Gelasius enter the ring 327

He also derived a judicial power from the hierarchy of the patriarchs and denied Constantinople all the prerogatives accepted by the empire and the church in the meantime. Furthermore, he took the side of the stronger Theoderic against Odoacer, who was on the defensive, and then used his position between the emperor, who was severely hampered by internal political squabbles and by Germanic and Hun invasions, and the king, who was behind himself, to push his claims to power to heights that would not be climbed again for more than three hundred years.⁶⁵

Of course, all popes knew what they owed believers and the Bible. And so Gelasius did not fail to affirm that he himself was completely unworthy of his office, that he was "the least of all men" (sum omnium hominum minimus). On the other hand, for all his unworthiness, he alone was charged with "the care" of all Christendom. And this care, according to Gelasius, concerned everything that affected the faithful,

their entire public and private life throughout the world.⁶⁶

Gelasius often quotes the alleged Jesus word in Matthew (16:18 f). He often insists on the Petrine nature of the Roman chair; for the chair of Blessed Peter first confirms the other chairs, consolidates them. And at the synod of March 495, which reinstated Legate Misenus (p. 311 f), he allowed himself to be humbly celebrated by the assembly – 45 bishops, 58 presbyters, plus some deacons and nobles representatives however unworthy. No less than eleven times the synodals acclaimed: "In you we see the Vicar of Christ", "In you we see the Apostle Peter"; whereby for the first time one saw in the Pope a Vicar of Christ and publicly declared him as such.⁶⁷

Gelasius, "the least of all men," cannot do enough to trumpet his own primatial power, his own rank, his own power to the East and, as it were, over the whole world in which he is the first. Because the highest and first is the divine, is God, the "summus et verus imperator". But what is divine is decided by Rome, the "first chair of the most blessed Peter", the "angelic chair". It is the guardian and executor of the truths of faith. Only what it recognizes has validity.

328 The war in the churches and for the churches He confirms every synod by virtue of the authority due to him alone. Gelasius was the first pope to add to the synodal statutes his decretalia together with those of his predecessors, i.e. he attributed to them the same importance as to the canons of the synods, which the East, of course, never recognized. Gelasius felt equally at ease above all, even declaring that any conciliar decree could be turned "into the opposite" by this See. Such assertions hung historically completely in the air, they were untrue. But they corresponded to the terrible tendency and, if one wants, immanent logic of the papal hunger for power (or, to put it more nicely: self-understanding), which began long before Gelasius and was characterized by the concept of "gubernare", of "gubernatio" (leadership, government), which incessantly recurred in curial letters of the 5th century and which for the time being culminated with him and went so far that Gelasius not only once considered the disregard or negation of papal claims to be an insult to God. The man pulled out all the stops to emphasize Rome's (and thus his own) primacy over all. "We cannot conceal what the whole Church on the continent knows, that the See of Peter has the right to resolve whatever has been bound by the decision of any bishops, and that he (the See) has the right to judge any church, while no one has the right to sit in judgment over him. The decrees have determined that appeals may be made to this See from all over the world, but that no appeal is allowed from it (to any other authority)" – a passage that has gone into numerous collections of canon law.⁶⁸

The Doctrine of Two Powers 329

The Doctrine of Two Powers, or the State as a Beadle to the Popes.

Although Gelasius as pope wrote only once to the emperor, his ambitious, even reckless epistolar offensives were directed not least to him, whom the henoticon implicated directly in the schism between the churches. And even if the Roman did not deny that the emperor surpassed the human race in dignity, for him, who here continued Ambrosian ambitions (cf. 1400 ff, 440), "crowned" him, he was merely a "son" (filius). As such, however, he allegedly could not judge men of the church. For he was not its head, but had only, in case of danger to his salvation, the right and the duty to pursue the interests of the church, to prosecute, to punish everything that aroused sedition in state and church, that incited schisms and "heresies". If the church has no or only little power, then the state acts for it: its office of ruler! In short, the Emperor must carry out the orders of that See which God has chosen to be master of all bishops. The Emperor is the servant of God, the Minister Dei.⁶⁹

It could not fail that the immense increase in power of the Catholica made it not only a combatant, but also a competitor and opponent of the State, as soon as the latter sought to curtail its ever greater, ever more insolent claims (always, even in the second century, still called "rights of God!"), which shrank from no falsification – then ever parried until today with the beautiful saying that one must obey "God"

more than men, that is, more the clergy than anyone else.

"As the soul surpasses the body, as heaven surpasses the earth, so spiritual power surpasses temporal power," already knew the Doctor of the Church Chrysostom. "The emperor's kingdom extends to the earth and earthly things, but our kingdom extends to souls and the care of them. But as much as the soul is exalted above all earthly things, so much must our kingdom be exalted above that of the emperor" (cf. p. 147 f). Ambrose,

too, had already written in the

330 The war in the churches and around the churches

Ambrose had already placed the concept of "religion" higher than that of state "order" (1438 ff). Yes, he could already quite openly assert the "far inferior value" of "royal splendor" to the "episcopal right of honor," using the not exactly modest parable of lead and gold.⁷⁰

Such uplifting phrases readily occurred to church leaders in conflict-laden situations.

In previous years, Patriarch Calandion of Antioch had been deposed for treason (485), Patriarch John I Talaiah of Alexandria for perjury by imperial criminal justice. So now Pope Gelasius I claimed – an old episcopal endeavor, to be sure! – claimed the *privilegium fori*. The emperor was not entitled to judge the clergy, since the disciple was not above the master. Divine as well as human laws, Gelasius said, decreed "that judgments should be passed on bishops at a council of bishops," even if they were "absent because of worldly error."⁷¹

What human laws might the pope have meant here? Constantine's constitution of 355 (1312)? It did not prove itself and soon had to be abolished. On the other hand, on April 15, 452, Valentinian III subordinated the bishops to the state courts in criminal matters! Pope Gelasius, however, had raised a new postulate with his claim of a special ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the "subordination" of the state criminal justice under the clerical arbitration court, had ridden a foolhardy attack on public law, in order to wrest from the emperor one of the most fundamental constitutional principles of ancient law in favor of the church.⁷²

But not enough. This pope, ignoring reality almost like a dreamer, denying the actual past, turning history upside down, calling the emperor not the head of the Church but her son, the "defender," the "guardian," the "patron" of the *Catholica*, "*fidei custos et defensor orthodoxae*," as did predecessor Felix III.

The two powers doctrine formulated in 331, Gelasius thus asserts (495) not only: "The entire Church throughout the world knows that the See of Blessed Peter has the right (*fas*) to dissolve whatever is bound by the aphorisms of whatever bishops", but he even puts forward the monstrous thesis: the emperor has to subordinate himself to the bishops in "divine matters", to learn from them, not to instruct them, not to rule, but to obey. He should bend his neck according to the will of God. Literally: "Two things (*quippe*) are indeed, exalted emperor, by which in the first place this world is governed: the sacred authority of the bishops (*auctoritas sacrata pontificum*) and the royal power (*regalis potestas*). Of these two, the weight of the priests is all the heavier, since they will also have to give account for the kings of men before God's judgment. For Thou knowest, most gracious Son, that although Thou art set above the human race in dignity (*dignitas*), Thou nevertheless piously bend the necks of the superiors (*praesulibus*) of divine things, and expect from them the means of Thy salvation."⁷³

This "doctrine of the two powers", which was established here for the first time, became the foundation of medieval canon law, and gained world-historical significance; for more than a millennium it was presumably the most quoted pope's word, a classic catchphrase, nevertheless only made up out of the fictions of his predecessors. Gelasius was not even concerned with the doctrine of two equal powers. Rather, he wanted to superordinate the episcopal power to the imperial one. He did not even shy away from subliminal threats: "For it is better that you hear in this life what I accuse you of, than in God's

court how I accuse you!... With what forehead will you one day ask for eternal reward the one whom you have unhinderedly persecuted here? "74

But this, as well as other outrageous presumptions of Gelasius – for example, that the successor of Peter was the first in the church and superior to all, that he judged in it without restriction and that no one in the whole world was allowed to evade his verdict, no one was allowed to challenge it – this was theory, was not in line with reality.

The war in the churches and around the churches

very far from reality and, moreover, possible only under the protection of Ostrogothic, curiously "heretical" rule. Admittedly, the "Handbook of Church History" denies this, even presenting us the Pope as a kind of resistance fighter, against the defeated Odoacer, of course. But even for the Catholic handbook it now becomes "clearer with every day ... that for Rome not the question of Chalcedon, but of the primatial status of Constantinople represented the questionable core of the matter". Whereby, however, no "greed for power" speaks from the champion of papal supremacy, but only "the feeling of his high responsibility before the judgment seat of God" (F. Hofmann) – with which just Gelasius so gladly threatens, with which they all threaten again and again75

Pope Gelasius fights the "pestilence" of schismatics, "heretics" and pagans

Only "for God's sake" certainly also, for nothing else, the incessant fight against schismatics and "heretics", which is often reflected in the approximately sixty letters or decretalia of this pope, but also in six theological treatises, four of them alone against the Monophysites.

Gelasius repeatedly accused the schismatic "Greeks," a word now repeated more often and signaling mutual distance, of stubbornness, "aberrations," and not even the dead, he knows, are "forgiven their errors." At the same time, he never attacked the henoticon – it is not even mentioned by him – directly, but only the personnel-political consequences of it. It was never primarily about the doctrine, always about the person, the chairs, the power. Gelasius showers these "Greeks" with accusations, rebukes, with scorn and derision. He wonders – "Miramur" like to begin his letters, "Valde mirati sumus", whatever dangerous involved. Constantinople, the imperial capital, Gelasius claims, is being

Pope Gelasius fights the "pestilence" 333 at all "not counted among the (great) chairs", had no metropolitan position at all, the patriarchal chair there, in fact the first one in the whole East after all and by the 28. The Patriarchal See there, in fact the first in the whole East and by the 28th canon of Chalcedon equal to the Roman one, had no rank and seat among the chairs – "nullum nomen", the Patriarch had no pontifical power at all to revise judgments of the "Apostolic See", which alone ruled on the truth, which Akakios and his followers so criminally disregarded, in short, "all" letters of the Pope had the same purpose: "to put the Eastern bishops in the wrong" (Ullmann).76

From the beginning, Gelasius provoked Patriarch Euphemius in Constantinople, who missed Gelasius* inaugural announcement but congratulated him nonetheless (a few years later he was accused of treason, dethroned, and deported). Of course, as his responsum makes clear, Gelasius had not even thought of reporting from the "first chair" of Christendom from a subordinate. Himself arrogant to the extreme, he accuses Euphemius of being "most presumptuous (arrogant)," he chides him for dereliction of duty, for weakness, and he finishes him off with dialectical dexterity, with biting sarcasm, with arrogance: "From the catholic and apostolic you see yourselves cast down to the heretical and condemned community.

This you know and do not deny...and invite us to descend (condescendere) with you from the heights to the depths..." Finally he ends with a subliminal threat: "We will come, brother Euphemius, without doubt we will come before that fearful and trembling tribunal of Christ" (pavendum tribunal Christi).... Just as threats of the Last Judgment, "the judgment seat of the eternal Judge and King," are frequent in Gelasius.77

Frequently, too, he turned against Akakios, the "crime" of the patriarch, against "the pestilence of

Eutyches," "the Eutychian contamination of the East," nothing but "obdurate wickedness," "decrepit wicked follies," "wretched agitation," "gossip"; where "Eutychianism" for him means a whole congeries of "heresies," "all the accomplices, followers, and fanciers of a once-sinners of a wickedness (pravitas) once condemned." And, of course, he took aim at all dissenters in the West as well. Even in 493, when the murderous battles at the Isonzo, near Verona, at the Adda, around Ravenna had just been fought, when a four-year war had devastated Upper Italy (p. 318 f), the pope wrote to Italian bishops of Picenum, a region at the Adriatic Sea, near today's Ancona: the devastation of their country by the "barbarians" pained him less than their forbearance against the diabolical temptations of the "heretics"! Thus he also turned against newly emerging Pelagian movements in Dalmatia, in which he saw only a stinking cesspool. The bishop Seneca, whom he excommunicated, he called a "frog who plunged full of ignorance into the slurry of the Pelagian swamp", an "unworthy corpse and a dead fly". He chased the Manichaeans out of Rome and had their books burned at the entrance to the Basilica of S. Maria (Major). A procedure, Hartmann Grisar SJ boasts, "quite similar to that under Leo the Great."78

Gelasius, standing here in the old Roman tradition, was not in the least irritated by objections of others; he simply remained "deaf" to them, treating them "completely disposable" (Caspar) and once scornfully excusing them as a "heretical" mishmash that knew "no distinction of true and false." His own self-confidence was such that he did not hesitate to refer sayings of Christ to himself and to compare himself with Christ!7' (But still in the 19th century even Pius IX, (But even in the 19th century Pius IX, the proclaimer of papal infallibility, whom even Catholic scholars, bishops, diplomats considered stupid, crazy, had applied the word of Christ: "I am the way, the truth and the life ..." to himself - however, also in 1870 by calling out to a cripple "Get up and walk!" an unsuccessful miracle healing had to be recorded!))80

Pope Gelasius also eliminated the last remaining and publicly tolerated pagan festival, the celebration of luperkalia: a kind of carnival, but more hearty, boisterous, offensive, and restricted to women. It was one of the most ancient festivals

Pope Gelasius combats the "pestilence"335 Roman religion, the oldest in the city, dedicated to the god Luperkus, the wolf-defending Pan. According to traditional opinion because of female infertility introduced, it had in any case a purifying and disaster-preventing strength. It is true that "un petit groupe de chretiens dissidents" (Pomares) were supposedly interested in it. In reality, however, even the Christians did not want to do without it. Gelasius, however, inculcated in his flock that one could not dine at the table of the Lord and the devil at the same time, could not drink from the cup of the Lord and the devil at the same time, preached against pagan magic, against godless customs and forbade merrymaking. And the Church made the Purification Feast of the Luperkalia into the Feast of the Feast of the Candlemas or Purification of Mary (Purificatio), originally celebrated on February 14, then on February 2, where it is still celebrated today.81

Pope Gelasius, who declared that in the condemnation of Arius all Arians and everyone who had fallen prey to this plague were inevitably included, did not want to mess with the Goths, the occupying power, the de facto rulers - this is too remarkable not to be noted here again - just as he did with the "Greeks"; yet these were only "schismatics", they were Catholics, the Goths "heretics" -and "barbarians" moreover! They had widely their Christian temples (cf. p. 320), their clergy. The pope was confronted with them everywhere. Even in Rome there was an Arian bishop and Arian churches almost next to the pope's residence! Yet Gelasius did nothing against the Goths, either as chancellor or as pope. While he was condemning the other "heretics", the Pagans, the Oriental schismatics with all robustness and infamy, while he was belligerent, pugnacious as few, he left the ruling Goths alone. Yes, he could not only dub the "heretic" king with the predicate of the highest imperial officials, "Your Glory"

(*magnificentia vestra*), but, which hardly has anything to do with courtly ceremonial, also ascribe to him pious Christian meaning. Obviously, Gelasius, who otherwise attacked all those of other faiths so furiously, only controlled himself because he himself was controlled – because his

336 The war in the churches and around the churches

The Germanic Arians were almost all over the Occident, not only in Italy, but almost all around it: in the north the Burgundians, in southern France, in Spain the Visigoths, in Africa the Vandals. So the so vociferous, not to say loud-mouthed Gelasius became quite meek, the classical principle of Catholicism also applied to him: with majority against tolerance; without it for it.⁸²

A peace pope does not reign long

Pope Anastasius II (496–498), under whose pontificate the world-historic conversion of Clovis, king of the Franks, took place, seemed more or less anxious, in his own words, "to bring peace to the nations."

Already in his first letter to Emperor Anastasios I, Pope Anastasius II writes: "The heart of your mild majesty is the sacred shrine (*sacra-rium*) of public welfare". Yes, he writes that he, the emperor, "God as his representative on earth [!] has commanded to preside". Obviously, this pope wanted negotiations with the ruler, he wanted to end the schism. Really he went so far with his reconciliation efforts towards Ostrom that a part of his clergy separated from him and formed a party against him, which also suspected him of "heresy". Even the author of the official "*Liber Pontificalis*", which now came into being, accuses him: "He secretly wanted to recall Akakios and failed to do so. Thus he died struck by the punishment of God" (*voluit occulte revocare Acacium et non potuit; qui nutu divino percussus est*).

This judgment, taken from the *Decretum Gratiani* as well as from Dante's "*Divina Commedia*", determined the crooked image of the Pope in history. In 1982, however, even the "*Handbook of Church History*", published with imprimatur, attests him "a reasonable policy". Already on November 19, 498, however, a sudden death struck him.

The Laurentian Schism 337

took him away. He could not even, as usual, secure the election of his successor. And now another local schism broke out in Rome. Once again, two popes were fighting each other, with the civil war for years undercutting any papal policy toward the East. The only issue now was power in Rome, in the "Apostolic See": a bloody struggle accompanied by a whole heap of fundamental falsifications.⁸³

The Laurentian Schism Street Fighting and Church Battles

On 22 November 498, the archipresbyter Laurentius became pope. His election by a minority had been achieved openly by Festus, the imperial-minded president of the Senate, through bribery, by gold from Constantinople, as Laurentius promised to sign the *Henotikon* in gratitude for his election as pope. But on the same day, in St. Peter's, they made the deacon Symmachus the Roman pontiff. And Symmachus, a Sardinian born as a pagan and baptized in Rome, who, by the way, was much more disputable in character than his opponent, had also bribed, albeit with the rather modest sum of 400 gold *solidi*, apparently collected by Theoderic. The Milanese bishop Laurentius (p. 318) had advanced it and the bishop Ennodius of Pavia (who had risen through Laurentius), a highly esteemed man of letters in the West and East, who sang about Venus in bad verse, but also about primitive Christianity, the deeds of Peter and Paul, had vouched for it; later he tried in vain to be reimbursed at the papal court.⁸⁴

Buying and selling bishop's seats, catching votes by bribes even and especially in papal elections, giving away church treasures, landed property, all this was certainly no longer unusual at the end of the 5th century. On the contrary. Already at that time, when the great bishop's chairs were usually occupied by the offspring of the nobility, most of the bishoprics were not used for

338 The War in the Churches and for the Churches merits, but for money. In doing so, the buyers often paid with possessions of the bishopric which they did not yet even possess, but which they had already assured the seller of by deed, so that in 532 King Athalarich protested vigorously against simony to Pope

John II (who was the first pope, since his name was Mercurius, to change his name).⁸⁵

The double election in 498 split all of Rome into two parties. The East-West schism was joined by a Roman one, the Laurentian schism. Street fighting and church battles followed. Then the world witnessed a rare spectacle: both popes left the decision to the Holy Spirit, who this time even spoke through a "heretic," the Goth king. Laurentius was an exponent of the faction loyal to the emperor, therefore affirming the henoticon, Symmachus was an advocate of the Chalcedonian symbol, therefore hostile to the henoticon. Theoderic examined the problem of the Holy Spirit in Ravenna and decided in favor of Symmachus, since the latter had the majority for himself and he himself had collected his gold.⁸⁶

Pope Symmachus (498-514) nevertheless did not have it easy even after the victory. It is true that in 499 he was able to remove his rival Laurentius as bishop to the bishopric of Nocera by means of many threats and promises. But the parties remained, the quarrel continued, journalistically and with arms. The opposition, the majority of the Senate, led by the distinguished Festus, seeking reconciliation with Constantinople almost at any cost, presented to the king in 501 a long register of Symmachus' sins, ranging from gluttony (it was compared to the gluttony of Esau) to squandering of church property to fornication with some "mulierculae," the best known of which was a Roman baker (with the rare nickname) Conditaria. Theoderic suspended the stricken saint and transferred her to Rimini for the time being. However, when even there, while Symmachus was walking quite unsuspectingly on the beach one morning, the well-known "mulierculae" appeared, the desired one now eluded their grasp and fled, head over heels, to Rome with only one companion.⁸⁷

The Laurentian Schism 339

Deprived of many churches and the Lateran Palace, he took refuge outside the city, in St. Peter's, and for the first time built there Episcopia, apartments for the bishop, from which gradually emerged the later papal residence, the Vatican, a place already disreputable in ancient times - "infamibus Vaticanis locis" (Tacitus). Theoderic, however, who in the meantime had already appointed the bishop of Altinum, Peter, as visitor for the Roman church, in 501, in agreement with Symmachus, had his case heard at an all-Italian council in Rome. But the attempt of the accusers to prove their accusations by the slaves of Pope Symmachus was stopped. Slaves were not allowed to testify by the holy synod. The unrest increased, and the fighting grew to greater and greater proportions. Finally, the majority of the synod declared themselves incompetent and wrote to the king: "It is up to your sovereign power to take care, at God's command, of the restoration of the Church, of the tranquility of the city of Rome and of the province. So we ask you, as a pious ruler, to come to the aid of our weakness and impotence, because priestly simplicity is no match for worldly cunning, and we can no longer endure danger to our life and limb in Rome. Rather, by a highly desired precept from you, allow us to return to our churches."

An embarrassing document. The "heretic" was supposed to help the "orthodox". Theoderic failed. Some of the fathers left, and the harried Symmachus did not want to negotiate either. At the beginning of September he left his asylum in St. Peter's and went with his clergy together with a crowd of people to the meeting place. His enemies, probably justifiably fearing an attack, rushed to meet him. Again there were street fights, wounded, dead, also many dead priests, among them the priest Gordian who was on Symmachus' side, the father of the later pope Agapet. And since Symmachus himself was almost stoned to death, having been "slaughtered with his clergy," as he thought, he refused to appear even before the council. Theoderic, exasperated because everywhere, he said, peace reigned but not in Rome,

The. War in the churches and around the churches

now allowed the synod, albeit reluctantly, to pass judgment even without an investigation. The Synod, however, from 115 bishops already melted down to 76, now ended "out of pious consideration" the

miserable comedy. At their fourth session, the so-called Palm Synod, they declared on October 23, 501, to leave the judgment to God, not to judge Pope Symmachus because of his immunity. They restored him to his office and left the "holy" city in a flight-like manner, since the majority of the clergy there tended to stand by Laurentius.⁸⁸

Thus the schism continued. The pope's guilt had become too obvious – indirectly through himself at a synod in November 502, but not least through a defense by the bishop Ennodius of Pavia, who was so devoted to Venus and the old gods in his verses that he feared for the guarantee of his 400 gold solidi. But even he did not want to vouch for the innocence of the pope – whom he literally called the regent of the heavenly kingdom, since he was a poet. He vindicated him high dignity already by the office, warned against polluting it by means of its bearer (!) and admonished everyone to sweep before his door. Fomented mainly by Festus and the senators, the civil war broke out now in full force, especially since antipope Laurentius, by Symmachus in the meantime (also) stripped of his episcopal dignity, came back with Theoderic's connivance and held Rome and all titular basilicas of the city, more than two dozen, almost completely in his hands. For about four years he resided with strong superiority in the Lateran, while Symmachus was confined to St. Peter's, where, as mentioned, he created the beginnings of the Vatican Palace. For years anarchy reigned, fighting under the battle cries of "Hie Symmachus!", "Hie Laurentius!". Alternately, both parties asked for the protection of the Arian king. The right of asylum of churches and monasteries was ignored, looted day and night, killed. Priests were beaten with clubs in front of the churches, nuns were abused and desecrated. In short, for years there was bloody strife.

The Symmachian Forgeries 341

between Rome's Catholics, until Theoderic, for political reasons, stood up for the weaker pope, and Laurentius, though personally even his worst opponents could attach no stain to him, had to give up the field in 506, and his clerical following, so far as it went over to Symmachus, had to condemn him expressly; likewise Bishop Peter of Altinum, the visitor of 501, already banished by Symmachus. Laurentius, the Greek-friendly antipope, became the victim of an anti-Byzantine swing of the king, partly also of the Senate, which, at Theoderic's behest, began to stand united with the Goths against Eastern Rome. While Symmachus, in gratitude for his victory, decorated the churches, especially St. Peter's, and donated new churches, the antipope supposedly ended his life in strict asceticism on the estate of his patron Festus. The schism itself, however, ended only with Symmachus' death.⁸⁹

The Symmachian Forgeries

Since the claim made during the trial of Symmachus, signed by 76 bishops, that the pope should not be judged by anyone, could not be substantiated from history, as the synod itself admitted, a partisan of the pope brazenly forged on it in Rome around 501. His main intention was to demonstrate the independence of the Roman bishop from any secular as well as spiritual court by resorting to fictitious cases of the past.⁹⁰

The papal side produced letters, decrees, council acts and historical reports. One fabricated. – In unbelievably primitive diction, in a Latin far more appropriate for "barbarians" than for Romans, which drastically demonstrates the decay of language and education, they fabricated precedents to support Pope Symmachus against his rival Laurentius: the apparent trial records of earlier popes, the *Gesta Liberii papae*, the *Gesta de Xysti purgatione et Polychronii*, the *Gesta de Xysti purgatione* and the *Gesta de Xysti purgatione et Polychronii*.

342– The war in the churches and around the churches *Jerosolymitani episcopi accusatione*, the acts of a synod of Sinuessa, *Sinuessanae synodi gesta de Marcellino*, allegedly from the year 303. All these processes were swindled in view of the Symmachus scandal, were freely invented, the similarities sometimes carried out to details, to the identity of certain localities. All the trials were made to turn out as they wished the outcome of the trial of Symmachus, so they always declared that "no one has ever

judged the pope, because the first chair is judged by no one". Or: "It is not allowed to pass judgment against the pope". Or: "No one is allowed to accuse his bishop because the judge will not be judged". And in a papal decree of the "Constitutio Silvestri", also forged from beginning to end, the conclusion is: "No one shall judge the first chair, from which all want to have right judgment assigned. Not by the emperor, not by all the clergy, not by kings, and not by the people shall the supreme judge be judged."¹ An almost exact – but admittedly nowhere linking to the past, entirely feigned counterpart of the Symmachus process are the *Gesta purgationis Xysti*. The pope is accused here by Roman nobles, like Symmachus by Festus and other aristocrats of Rome. Like Symmachus, he is accused of fornication, in this case with a nun. And as against Symmachus his slaves should appear, so also here a papal slave serves as a witness. But an exconsul – in the role of Symmachus' supporter and exconsul Faustus – puts a stop to the trial. For: 'It is not permitted to pass judgment against the pope.'²

These great forgeries, which are "a burden to the Symmachian party, respectively to Symmachus himself" (v. Schubert), but according to the Jesuit Grisar have only "a completely private character", are not only significant in contemporary history. Supposedly quite private, they later played a major role in canon law. They went, in revised form, partly into the *Liber Pontificalis* and found wide circulation through it. Yes, the formula of the forger "*Prima sedes a nemine iudicatur*" became –.

The Symmachian Forgeries 343

cynical irony of history – the formula for papal jurisdictional primacy! At Leo III anno 800 one invoked it. And also Gregory VII drew on the falsifications literally in 1076.³

Remarkable: the journalistic polemics in these disputes.

For precisely because heavy charges were brought against Symmachus, precisely because he obviously could not justify himself sufficiently, precisely because he, as was certain, had squandered church goods and his opponents sneered in a pamphlet about the "old and decrepit bishops" with their "hordes of women", precisely for this reason it was stated here for the first time: the Roman bishop could not be judged by anyone! As a man he had to atone in the hereafter, but on earth he was untouchable, exempt from any judicial atonement. And when a pamphlet "Against the Synod of Unrighteous Absolution" appeared, Symmachus' partisan deacon Ennodius now claimed in his defense even for the Roman bishops an innocence and sanctity inherited from Peter. According to Ennodius' momentous theory Peter had left "an eternal treasure of merits as an inheritance of innocence to the successors. What was handed down to him for the sake of his bright deeds belongs to them, whom an equal radiance of change enlightens. For who would doubt that he is holy who holds such a high dignity? Even if he lacks good works acquired by his own merit, those performed by the predecessor on the throne (Peter) are sufficient ..." So, even if a pope lacks his own good works (and we may add: he may do bad ones himself), those done by Peter are sufficient to anoint him! Does not this touch the border of religious crook ideology? Stripes?! In 1075, Pope Gregory VII, in his infamous *Dictatus papae*, took matters to the extreme by claiming that a duly ordained pope would necessarily be blessed by the merits of Peter! What was more, behind Ennodius, the later bishop of Pavia's speculation, Symmachus – met.

344 0 war in the churches and around the churches.

partisan Bishop Avitus of Vienne with a sentence, "All our standing we feel wavering when the standing of the supreme (papa urbis) is shaken under accusation. "94

To the struggles between Laurentians and Symmachians, as well as their forgeries, the official papal book, the *Liber Pontificalis*, which had considerable nimbus in the Middle Ages, owes its emergence. Both sides, in fact, began a collection of papal biographies, albeit under contrary aspects, and continued it until the year 530 and 555, respectively. As in the Symmachian forgeries, the literary form of the "highly famous papal history" (Seppelt) is remarkably primitive; measured against the higher level of

education of the time, characterized "by ignorance of even the elements of grammatical and rhetorical school knowledge" (Caspar). To be sure, these Roman clerics were "animated by faith in their church," but "simple in spirit" (Hartmann). After all, they worked unhesitatingly pro domo, naming the "popes" in uninterrupted order from Peter onward – a smooth invention for the earliest times (pp. 69 ff). And they have also, in the first three centuries, unconcernedly made the popes martyrs by the stereotypically recurring formula "Hic martyrio coro-natur"; also almost throughout falsification (p. 101). But not only the first pontificates are faked, not only almost all martyrdoms; also as author of the papal book Pope Damasus (for the time preceding his pontificate) was falsely given and this was believed by the Middle Ages. And since also the prelude of the whole, the introductory correspondence between Damasus and Jerome (one epistle each) is falsified throughout: p. 70 f), the highly famous papal book begins with nothing but falsifications –just as also the alleged primacy of the popes themselves is based on pure fraud.⁹⁵

"Battle front position: Gothic Empire and Rome against Byzantium" 345

"Battlefront Position: Gothic Empire and Rome against Byzantium."

Meanwhile, Theoderic was not willing to limit himself to Italy and Dalmatia. He had systematically striven for a Germanic federation of states and gathered all anti-Byzantine forces. He pushed his border protection beyond the Adriatic. In 504 he occupied Sirmium. And in the following year, the tense foreign policy situation even led to a serious conflict between troops of Theoderic and the emperor. The Goth had allied himself with the neighboring Gepid prince Mundo. And when the magister militum of Illyricum, Sabinianus, threatened him with a strong army, ten thousand federated Bulgarians, a Gothic contingent of 2,000 men on foot and 500 horsemen under Pitzia rushed to the aid of the Gepids from the newly conquered Panno-nian border province. In the plain of Morava the imperial army was almost completely annihilated; what did not fall by the sword from the Bulgarians drowned in the river. The conquered land became part of Theoderic's empire as Pannonia Sirmiensis.⁹⁶

The West was now increasingly undisguised in its opposition to the emperor – troubled in the East by the Persian danger – who placed a rudimentary measure of blame on the pope. Symmachus had hardly been able to attend to theology and schism for almost a decade because of the serious church dispute in Rome. It was not until about 506 that he was finally able to assert himself, and he answered an unfriendly letter from the emperor, who was increasingly open to the Monophysites, with rather greater rudeness and arrogance. Omitting all official courtesies, he coldly and hurtfully apostrophizes the aged ruler as merely "imperator," accuses him of believing in a Christ who is only half, trumpets that his "honor is certainly the same, not to say the higher," threatens him long and wide with the judgment of God, and concludes with as much acerbity as self-righteousness and hypocrisy: "The comrade of wickedness cannot but persecute him who is untouched by wickedness." ⁹⁷

346 The. War in the churches and around the churches

The fronts between Eastern and Western Rome thus tended to harden even more, especially since the pope also took Theoderic's side. And the Roman Senate again collaborated with the Roman priests, which outraged Constantinople. The emperor, branding the pope a "Manichean," spoke in a sharp letter to Symmachus of a conspiracy of the Senate with the Roman Church against the Empire. But protected by the Goth king, the pope, who was now fighting the Eastern Roman clergy with all vehemence, reacted brazenly, even insolently. Not only did he claim that the emperor wanted him to "join the heretics head over heels," but in the vilest return he even called him a "patron of the Manichaeans," not shying away from the lie that in the Orient only the Catholics were oppressed, but that almost all "heresies" were permitted. "Do you think," wrote Pope Symmachus to Anastasios, "that because you are emperor you need not fear God's judgment? Do you think that as emperor you are beyond the power of Peter, the prince of the apostles?... Compare the dignity of the emperor with that of the head of the

church. The one is only responsible for worldly affairs, the other for divine things.⁸

The resolute opposition of Anastasios to the Catholics naturally formed the circles loyal to Chalcedon all the more and gradually pressed him more and more. The new court patriarch Makedonios II (496–511) also had to sign the Henotikon, but he also maneuvered between the fronts in such a way that the Orthodox at times regarded him as a "heretic". But finally he took a public stand against the Monophysites, snubbed the ruler, and perhaps tried to incite a riot. Anastasios' patience was exhausted. Like Euphemios, the predecessor, he deposed Makedonios and sent him into exile to Eu-chai'ta on the night of August 7, 511. The new head of the church of Constantinople, Timotheos (511–518), was more docile to the emperor. And since in Alexandria Patriarch John III. Nikiotes (505–516) sat, in Antioch in 512 the monk Severos (512–518 and 538), strongly favored by Anastasios, came to the helm, the three be-

"Battle Front Position: Gothic Empire and Rome vs. Byzantium "347 clearest patriarchates of the East were dominated by Monophysites.

Catholic bishops, monks now incite against the "heretic emperor" more and more to rebellion, especially in Asia Minor and the Balkans. The Pope, after deposing Make-donios (511), recalls the pagan emperors of the persecutions of Christians. He demands vigilance in the East, fidelity, readiness for martyrdom. He speaks of the "heavenly army service" and writes: "Now is the time when faith demands its fighters and calls to its defense those whom the glow of grace struck".

Even earlier, there had been occasional outrages under Anastasios, although a political occasion "cannot be proven in most cases" (Tinnefeid). Already for the first year of the emperor's reign Marcellinus Comes reports: "Civil war among the Byzantines; most of the city and the circus incinerated". In 501, at the center of the turmoil is the pagan festival of Brytai (or Bryta). Around 510 Constantinople's inflamed mob throws the monks of the monophysite Seve-ros out of St. Sophia's Church during the service; indeed, the emperor, who therefore calls Patriarch Makedonios to account, must think of flight. In 512, his Monophysite policy is again at stake. There is a real uprising, not least fomented by monks, in which the monarch, as clever as he is courageous, faces the mutinous masses unarmed. A new emperor is already proclaimed, Monophysites are killed by the crowd, troops are deployed against them, houses of high officials are burned, finally the unrest is stifled by arrests and executions. Around the same time in Antioch, Monophysite monks from near and far, even from Syria II, violently invade the city in several waves and many of them find death. But even the revolt in 514, related to the successes of the usurper Vitalian, has religious backgrounds, and even Benedictine Rhaban Haacke admits that in these agitations and revolts against Emperor Anastasios the people of Constantinople were

348 War in the Churches and around the Churches were "under the skillful leadership of the monks and the high clergy."

The Catholics also had the ruler's relatives in their hands. Empress Ariadne deeply regretted his church policies. Pompey's nephew corresponded with the pope and was an ardent Catholic. So were his wife Anastasia and her friend Juliana Anicia, a Western Roman emperor's daughter, descendant of Theodosius I, whose husband Areobindos, army commander of the East, was proclaimed counter-emperor in 512 during the dangerous Catholic uprising in Constantinople. Anastasios was almost overthrown at that time. One can see how the threads ran.¹⁰⁰

In 513, the military Vitalian rebelled and brought the empire to the brink of disaster.

The empire-subordinate Goth from the province of Scythia, today's Dobruja, who commanded the regiments of the foederati, took advantage of the ecclesiastical-political disputes and made "orthodoxy" his slogan in accordance with the Council of Chalcedon. He acted as spokesman for the clerical opposition, demanding the reinstatement of the expelled bishops and a council with the pope. He was the latter's confidant, also established contacts with the Ostrogothic king, and became "the great teacher

of the Huns and Slavs" (Rubin) through his actions, his example of combined land and sea attacks against the empire, his extortion of funds, and his military drill.¹⁰¹

In 513, Vitalian had eliminated two high officers who were obstructive to him and had led his mutinous regiments, reinforced by rapacious Bulgarians, disaffected peasants, ostensibly for the doctrine of the two natures before Constantinople and demanded the surrender of the imperial church policy. Anastasios found himself in dire straits. He made promises that he did not keep when Vitalian left after eight days, pursued by the emperor's nephew, Hypatios. His great army, however, suffered a terrible defeat at Odessos (Varna on the Black Sea); allegedly 60,000 dead. The Catholics rioted in the capital. And in 514 Vitalian appeared -.

"Battle front position: Gothic Empire and Rome against Byzantium" 349 who had captured the imperial nephew at Odessos and (according to a somewhat uncertain reading) put him in a pigsty -again appeared before the walls of Constantinople, this time also with a large fleet in the Bosphorus. He kept making new demands in his advances. First he forced his appointment as magister militum. Then he demanded the abandonment of the imperial church policy, reinstatement of the deposed and banished chief shepherds, negotiations with the Roman See. He had also wrung from the emperor a sworn promise to convene a council for July 1,

515, at Heracleia in the province of Europe, where the pope would preside and carry out church unification. "Rome," that is, the meanwhile reigning Pope Hormisdas (514-523), "relied on the mediation [!] Vitalian," writes Benedictine Haacke. For the ransom of the imperial nephew Hypatios, Vitalian extorted from Anastasios the unheard-of sum of 5000 pounds of gold. (Hypatios, who sympathized with the Catholics, made a pilgrimage to the Holy Sepulchre in 516, in gratitude for his salvation from the greatest distress, where he made rich donations to the churches and monasteries of the city and its surroundings). However, the other negotiations failed because of the Roman's exalted claims, who insisted on a deep humiliation of the Eastern patriarchs. Thus a third attack by the papal "mediator" took place, and it was "while the legations were still being exchanged and the negotiations were going on ..." (Haacke). Vitalian, whose contacts with Hormisdas the latter himself confessed to the emperor, apparently in order to make him compliant, attacked Constantinople in 515 - when the council was to take place and in the summer forty bishops of the Balkan provinces separated from their chief metropolitan and turned to the pope - by water and by land; whereby the pope at this repeated "mediation" as well as King Theoderic obviously counted on the defeat of the aged emperor. Vitalian, however, was badly beaten by the civilian Marinus-whom Justin, the next emperor, commanded on a fast sailing ship-with novel means of combat (a type of "Greek fire" used here for the first time), and the victory was won by the

350 The war in the churches and around the churches.

leader of the Monophysites, Patriarch Severos of Antioch.¹⁰²

Only a hasty retreat saved Vitalian. And Anastasios at first no longer thought of conducting further "negotiations" with Rome. Rather, in the summer of 516, he also sent the Orthodox patriarch of Jerusalem, Elias (494-516), who refused to enter into communion with Severus, into exile in order to enforce Monophysitism in Jerusalem as well, admittedly in vain. His successor John III (516-524), under strong pressure from the Catholic monks of his own region, also refused to join Severus and was therefore sent to the state prison of Caesarea. Even after his release John did not deliver the expected declaration of devotion, but hurled in Jerusalem before about 10,000 fanatically demonstrating monks the excommunication curse against emperor's favorite Severos and his cause - all the more impressive, because just the emperor's nephew, Hypatios, was present as a pilgrim and distanced himself from Severos. The dux Palaestinae, Anastasius, the representative of the state, took flight. Far and wide, Catholics thus sought to push back Monophysitism, to encroach on its domains, not least from the

West.103-.

When Pope Hormisdas sent a legation, including Bishop Ennodius of Pavia, to the Eastern Roman regent in early April 517, he gave it, in addition to the official mail, nineteen secret promotional letters (contestationes), propaganda material that his monastic agents in the East soon eagerly disseminated. Hormisdas aspired to nothing less than the leadership of the whole Church. Through a subdeacon he had the bishops of the Balkans obliged to "follow the apostolic see in all things and to proclaim all its decrees". Unmistakably, the "Vicar of Christ", covered by the Gothic king Theoderic and expecting a new attack of the Goth Vitalian, who was already ready for it, aimed at the ecclesiastical overthrow. He encouraged the Romanist prelates of the Eastern Empire to "fearlessly go to war," even openly appealing to the

"Battlefront Position: Gothic Empire and Rome against Byzantium "351 capital population. Jesuit Hugo Rahner: "Pope Hormisdas went down in history as the great victor and peace hero". The old Anastasios did not put up with this, immediately put the papal legates on a less seaworthy ship, ordered the captain not to dock at any city and sent them home. He then informed the pope on July 11, 517, without sharpness, but firmly, of the breaking off of the negotiations. "If certain people," he wrote to him, "who derive their spiritual authority from the apostles themselves, do not want to fulfill in their disobedience the pious teaching of Christ, who suffered to redeem all, then we do not know where a magisterium of the merciful Lord and great God can meet us.... To be offended and disregarded we can bear, but to be commanded we cannot" (iniuriari enim et annullari sustinere possumus, iuberi non possumus).¹⁰⁴

Emperor Anastasios refrained from any vehement words, as Caspar comments, "but it was out of the genuine and strong feeling of a sincerely pious man and a ruler at the end of his days, who for twenty years had been struggling tirelessly for the religious and ecclesiastical unification of the Orient within and with the West, that he opposed the papal intransigence, which, with its Acacius challenge, was perpetuating the inner self-destruction of the imperial Church." ¹⁰⁵

Certainly not unwelcome to the pope in this year (517) was a massacre in the East.

The tragedy occurred on a pilgrimage of Catholic monks to the pillar saint Symeon, to a mass demonstration northeast of Beroea. As these monks, reinforced by ever new crowds, passed through the bishopric of Apamea, they were attacked about 20 kilometers south of the city, 350 of them slain on the spot, others stabbed to death in a nearby church to which they fled. Instigators of the tragedy, according to the monks' accusation: the Bishop Petros of Apamea and Patriarch Severos of Antioch. The monks protested to the emperor and the pope. Their appeal, writes Jesuit Heinrich Bacht, "may have been in Rome at the end of 517. Hormisdas, who took advantage of this good [!]

352. The war in the churches and for the churches to come into contact with the East, immediately grasped, sent under io. February 518 his answer. The letter is full of praise and encouragement ____", w Almost ninety years old, Emperor Anastasios died during a heavy thunderstorm night of July 8-9, 518 - "struck by God's lightning," as the Liber Pontificalis triumphed, according to rumors circulating in Rome. Anastasios had left behind a huge treasury, but neither children nor a successor. Yet immediately, as early as July 9, the commander of a guard regiment at court, Comes excubitorum Justin, ascended the throne.¹⁰⁷

JUSTINIAN I (527-565) THE THEOLOGIAN ON THE IMPERIAL THRONE.

"The goal is clearly one empire, one Church, and apart from it no salvation and no hope on earth, and one emperor whose foremost concern is precisely the salvation of this Church. In the pursuit of this goal Justinian knows no fatigue, and with obsessive thoroughness he pursues what seems wrong to him to the last recesses..." Handbook of Church History*

"It has always been our zealous endeavor, and still is, to preserve intact the right, undefiled faith and the safe continuance of the holy catholic and apostolic Church of God. This we have always regarded as the

most urgent of our governmental concerns." "And it is because of this desire that we have undertaken such great wars against Libya and the West for the "right believer in God and for the freedom of subjects."" Emperor Justinian I?

"Some he killed without cause, others he let out of his clutches struggling with poverty, made them more miserable than dead men, that they begged that the most miserable death might put an end to their condition. He also took the lives of some along with their fortunes. But since it was nothing for him to dissolve the Roman Empire alone, he could not have accomplished the conquest of Libya and Italy for any other reason than to ruin, together with his former subjects, the people there also." The contemporary Byzantine historian Prokopios³

"The smoking ruins of Italy, the annihilation of two Germanic peoples, the impoverishment and sensitive decimation of the long-established inhabitants of the Western Empire were likely to open everyone's eyes to the background of Eastern Roman religious policy ... The Catholic clergy bears a good part of the responsibility for the outbreak of the internecine wars of the age ... The influence of the church reached to the last village." Berthold Rubin⁴

"- and thus began the first Golden Age of Constantinople". Cyril Mango⁵

Overthrow under Justin I (518-527) or from swineherd to CATHOLIC EMPEROR.

With Emperor Justin, literally overnight, began a turbulent change of front, a new era of religious politics, triumphs Rome, Orthodoxy.

Born around 450 in Tauresium/Bederiana (near Naissus or today's Skopje), the Illyrian farmer's son had risen from swineherd to general, while his sister Bigleniza was still hustling in Tauresium as a staid peasant. Justin, who had fought in the Isaurian War, Persian War, and Vitalian's Civil War, was a thick-skulled bearish illiterate who could barely read, much less write, not even quite his name, yet was peasant-smart, secretive, grasping, and a staunch Catholic. "He had no qualifications whatsoever to rule a province, let alone a world empire" (Bury). Yet, "supposes" Jesuit Grillmeier, he was a supporter of the Council of Chalcedon even before his elevation to ruler.

Meanwhile about 67 years old, he was from the beginning under the decisive influence of his nephew and successor Justinian, then about 36 years old, also under that of the Catholic clergy, especially of the monasticism. Justin and Justinian had obviously prepared the change of power long ago. Already before the overthrow there were contacts with faith fighter Vitalian and the pope. The actual pretenders to the throne, the two nephews of the deceased emperor, the army commander Hypatios and overthrow under Justin I 355

Pompey, the latter a particularly zealous Catholic, were eliminated, as in general, already denounced by Prokop and Euagrius, the emperor's numerous relatives were cheated out of power. Still in the night of Anastasio's death Justin bribed, who the next day - what a disgusting smear! - apparently resisted in every way to take over the crown, the burden, everything that could be bribed to secure the succession. In doing so, he squandered all the money he had accepted for the launching of another pretender to the throne, from his uncle, Grand Chamberlain Amantios! So immediately at Justin's elevation on the following day - a true "imperial weather" after the night thunderstorm -, on July 9, 518, one could emphasize that he owed his emperorship above all to God, the Almighty, one could shout again and again: "Emperor, you are worthy of the Trinity, worthy of the Empire, worthy of the city" and on the next Sunday, July 15, celebrate a pompous service in the Hagia Sophia.⁶

Nevertheless, the takeover of the government did not take place without turmoil and bloodshed, even though it was obviously well planned and prepared, even though the whole network of intrigues and cross connections was only visible to a few people at that time. It came to wild confusion, repeated wheeling scenes even in the Sophienkirche. Several contenders for the throne appeared, briefly, like shooting stars, and immediately disappeared in the seething ruckus. And when the bribed senate

nominated Justin, a group of opponents pounced on him, one of them split his lip with his fist, whereupon his men stripped bare, sabered the onslaught and drove them away.⁷

In any case, the illiterate Catholic, though certainly only with the help of the superior nephew standing behind him, managed everything in one day: election, confirmation and crown on his head.

Despite his oath at the election not to persecute any competitor or previous opponent, Justin immediately purged the court of undesirable elements, of everything that had supported the "heretic emperor". Almost immediately after the feast of

356 Justinian I.

The opposition was eliminated, almost all eunuchs, Cubiculare: the Cubicularius Misael banished, ditto the chamberlain Ardabur, the chamberlain Andreas Lausiacus beheaded, even more naturally beheaded the grand chamberlain Amantios, whose bribes Justin had fraudulently spent on himself. Candidate for the throne Theocritus, the nephew and pretended straw man of Amantios, who, being a eunuch, could not become emperor himself, was stoned to death, his corpse thrown into the sea. The victims obviously sympathized with the Monophysites and were also celebrated by them as martyrs. But even before their liquidation "the Benedictus and the Three May Holy had been sung", the Chalcedon feast had "celebrated its premiere in the Constantinople liturgy" (Grillmeier SJ). Already one day after the assassination of the competition, the names of Pope Leo I as well as those of the Catholic-minded Patriarchs Euphemios and Makedonios were included in the Eucharistic prayer. And as early as September 7, the imperial nephew Justinian was able to report to Rome, "The majority of the faith (questions) have already been settled by God's help . . ."⁸

Justin I had already announced his elevation - "God's grace" - to the Patriarchs of the Empire on August 1, also to Pope Hormisdas, proclaiming to "Holiness" "that we have been chosen and confirmed to rule first of all by the indivisible grace of the Trinity, then by the distinguished dignitaries of our imperial palace and the most venerable senate, plus the faithful army, though against our will and reluctantly. We ask you now to implore with your holy prayers to the divine power that the beginnings of our rule may be strengthened. It behooves us to hope this, and you to help it come to fruition." In his congratulatory letter, the pope emphasized the God-given election and hoped for an early church unification.⁹

Justin's seizure of power was supported by the army, to which the old warhorse was then sent - to every soldier! - the Chalcedonian

Overthrow under Justin I 357

Catholicism, since Justin's sympathy for it was of course well known; and the mass of the people, who were impressed not least by his origins as a swineherd and his "orthodoxy," since the capital was predominantly Catholic. The priests apostrophized him as God-loving and most Christian emperor.

And nephew Justinian confessed in 520 that Justin based his rule "on the holy religion".¹⁰

So now the faith formula of Chalcedon applied again. For Justinian, the authoritative man of the new government, at least already for church policy, "understood that only a clear yes to Chalcedon offered any prospect of satisfying the empire" (Bacht SJ). In other words, the Catholic Church, as long as it was deprived of the key role, would have eternally ensured discord, and "pacification" now meant, as history shows and will henceforth always show, there is somehow the possibility of it: Suppression of all other religions. This was also the understanding of Pope Hormisdas, who wrote to the emperor: "Behold how much the madness of the old enemy still rages daily. While the matter has long since been decided by a final verdict, peace suffers delay..." The pope, however, wanted to "return to love", wanted peace, that peace, of course, which he also praised to the emperor with the pseudo-pacifist Bible word: Glory to God in the highest and peace to men on earth who are of good will! Because of good will there are always only those who want what Rome wants. Berthold Rubin comments succinctly and accurately in

his brilliant monograph on Justinian: "Peace for those who are of the same mind, war and terror for those who think differently".¹¹

358 Justinian I.

Persecution of the Monophysites under Justin I.

Justin and Justinian, as evidenced by a papal letter, had conspired with Rome even before the overthrow. They had gained power with the help of the Catholics; now they had to show their gratitude, especially since Pope Hormisdas wanted something clear: posthumous demonization of Akakios together with his successors Euphemios and Makedonios, who "certainly did their best" (Handbook of Church History), as well as of their protectors, the emperors Zenon and Anastasios; but not least the confession of the Roman Church and obedience to its decisions by signing the "form" sent by him. Instantly they eliminated the Monophysite religious policy of Anastasios and went on a counter-course. Already at the beginning of his reign, in 519 or 520, Justin had, after all, demanded in an edict that all regular Roman soldiers accept the Creed of Chalcedon under threat of severe punishment. And since he was determined to enforce this confession throughout the empire, extensive persecutions of heretics, Arians, Monophysites and all other dissenters began, especially in Syria and Palestine: Monophysites and all other dissidents, whereby financial motives always played a role (as the new masters soon brought their relatives into influential civil and military positions). Severe punishments affected the clergy, the laity, even children.¹²

The expelled Catholic prelates, illustrious officers and officials were immediately recalled, 54 bishops of the opposite side were posthumously chased into exile, where Philoxenus, the Metropolitan of Mabbug (Hierapolis), died soon after in Thrace. The Constantinople Patriarch John II (518-520), still elected under Anastasios and devoted to him, had been forced, barely a week after Justin's accession, on Sunday, July 15, under the pressure of the incited fanatically roaring masses and "orthodox" monks, first of all the superorthodox Akoimetenj in the Hagia Sophia to publicly deny his faith, to reject

persecution of the Monophysites under Justin I 359

of the Henotikon, recognition of Chalcedon, as well as to the condemnation of the actual Monophysite leader Severos of Antioch – he later (September 29, 518) fled, like many a Monophysite bishop, to Egypt, and immediately the patriarch had consented, though certainly not light-heartedly. (More difficult for him than anything was the condemnation of his predecessors in Constantinople and the erasure of their names in the diptychs. But the pope insisted again and again). Soon they created a "Chalcedon Festival", a permanent institution in the calendar of Constantinople. Immediately after the liquidation of the Cubiculare, Justin, supported by the forced petition of a synod under the court patriarch, issued a circular order punishing any "heresy," especially the Monophysite confession, and urging the provincial governors to take appropriate action. "The result was savage terror, which mainly affected the Monophysites. Only in countries of absolute majority of dissenters did the government not dare to press for literal realization of its demands. Wherever the Orthodox felt strong enough, a flood of persecutions descended upon the Monophysites. Their most fanatical followers, especially the monks, unceremoniously wandered into the desert and founded a series of emigrant settlements that remained inaccessible to state authority" (Rubin). The Pope's confidant and beloved son, Vitalian, even called for the physical mutilation of the Monophysite leader Severus. The "Severian hierarchy" was suppressed all around, persecuted, without the Monophysite Church, abruptly pushed into illegality, heretical, could have been destroyed. Even the bones of dead "heretics" were wanted to be destroyed.¹³

But not everyone submitted.

In Egypt, the center of opposition for the next fifty years, the Monophysite resistance could not be broken, despite all the depositions of bishops and persecutions. And in Syria, too, they showed their teeth. There was widespread turmoil there. The newly elevated Catholic prelates were mostly able to

officiate only with military help.

360 Justinian I.

If the most prominent victim of the Monophysite

pogroms under Justin was Patriarch Severos of Antioch, who tirelessly organized the counter-defense from Egypt and became saint of the Yako-bites, the Copts (feast: February 8), the most ferocious Monophysite hunter at the time was Severos' successor, Paulos II (519-521), called the Jew, a former innkeeper from Constantinople. He opened a severe persecution in his diocese. About forty bishops who adhered to Severos lost their sees. Patriarch Paulos chased the monks from the monasteries, the stylites from the columns, he drove people like wild animals over mountains, through the fields, exposed them to snow, cold, deprived them of food, property, had them banished, tortured, killed. Clerics and laymen were affected by his rage, men and women, even children. Finally Justin had to remove him because of his crimes.¹⁴

The monks of Edessa, who refused to accept the Chalcedonense, were expelled by the new bishop Asclepius in the middle of winter, at Christmas, by force of arms, although many of them were old and sick. Only after six years of exile they could return. Also numerous other "heretics" were banished under bishop Asclepius, tortured in all ways, killed, until he himself, in the winter of 524/25 was driven out by the population.¹⁵

The libellus Hormisdas

Pope Hormisdas, the father of the later Pope Silverius, however, wanted even more: total subjugation. She always wants Rome, the possibility exists. And of course his ambitions went beyond the elimination of the church directives of a Zenon, an Anastasios, beyond the realm of religion at all, because basically it is always about money only, about validity, power. Thus, even now, the Roman See sought the "extension of papal influence over the internal life of the

The libellus Hormisdas 361

Oriental empire in general, on its politics and on other sides of the complicated machinery of government" (Vasiliev).¹⁶

Hormisdas sent his demands and many letters with a legation in January 519; one presbyter, two deacons, including the future Pope Felix. On March 15, the entire Senate received them already ten miles from Constantinople—at the head Justinian and the long-recalled Vitalian, the old warrior of the faith; both Hormisdas called his "beloved sons." With burning lights, with songs of praise, the legation was caught up and a letter from the pope was handed to the emperor, who quite generously sprinkled incense on the crowned professional butcher. He praised him as predestined by God, as a born bringer of peace. Not the emperorship was an adornment for him, no, he for the emperorship. The peoples had longed for Justin for a long time, even before that the "sweet smell" of him had reached Rome, so that it was true: "I knew you before I prepared you in your mother's womb. , "17

In fact, Pope Hormisdas had smelled correctly. As once Anatolios had to sign Leo's doctrinal letter under the pressure of Marcian and Pulcheria (p. 228), so now John II (518-520) of Constantinople crawled completely to the cross. At Justin's command he signed the libellus Hormisdas presented in the text. Akakios was publicly cursed, even the name of Zenon, Anastasios was deleted from the ecclesiastical diptychs. Moreover, the Patriarch and the Emperor, in an unprecedented letter, a reply to the letters of the Pope, recognized his claim to rule over the whole Church. And about 2500 bishops concurred! A total submission, a rare great victory of Rome; admittedly, as the next decades showed, a kind of Pyrrhic victory. Many see in the government of Justinian, the Catholic emperor, "one of the most shameful defeats of the papacy" (H. Rahner SJ). In the meantime, however, Hormisdas triumphed: "Gloria in excelsis Deo ... "18

The unification of Constantinople and Rome, which led to the re-establishment of the papacy, was not

a success.

362 Justinian I.

The unification of Constantinople and Rome, which led to the re-establishment of a great Roman and Catholic empire along with the complete annihilation of two Germanic peoples, had also divided the East more deeply than ever before.

Even during the stay of the papal envoys (until July 9, 520) in Constantinople, it was drastically demonstrated how much the disputes continued there, how much some bishops clung to the henoticon, how difficult it was for some to decide to posthumously send their predecessors or even Akakios to the devil.

The matter concerned signatures to the so-called libellus, the "Regula fidei Hormisdas" emanating from the primacy of Rome, the recognition of the Council of Chalcedon and "all the letters" of Pope Leo I. Metropolitan Dorotheos of Thessalonica therefore sent two bishops to Constantinople in 519 with bribes, according to the Pope's legate, John, "which would have been able to dazzle not only men but even angels". And when Bishop John himself came to Thessalonica to have Metropolitan Dorotheos sign his master's libellus, the archbishop did not think of it, made objections, and finally let Christianity, which he had inflamed, fall upon John. Two of the prelate's servants were beaten to death, as was his host, and the legate himself was seriously wounded. Only the police saved him from complete martyrdom. When Hormisdas summoned Dorotheos to Rome for "instruction in the Catholic faith", Dorotheos did not follow him at all, but wrote to His Holiness: "What need is there of long discourse, since all things can be revealed to you by our Lord and God Jesus Christ, and can satisfy you...". He lied to the Roman that he had protected his envoy at the risk of his life. And the pope, who could not get the emperor to remove the archbishop from office, meekly relented and finally replicated that whoever did not know his innocence must think that he had "strayed from the Christian path".¹

Basically, Hormisdas, like every prudent pope until the 20th century, did not mind a little persecution.

One knows that: it furnishes, wakes up the sleepers, gathers them around the

The libellus Hormisdas 363

Cross. "My brothers, nothing new is persecution for the Church," wrote Hormisdas already at the beginning of the disputes with the ecclesiastical policy of the Justinian dynasty. "And yet, it is precisely when she is humiliated that she rises up, and in the losses inflicted on her she grows rich. The faithful know it by experience: with the death of the body one gains the life of the soul. Void things pass away, but eternal things are exchanged. The persecution is tested... Our Lord was the first to go up to the cross."²⁰

Even at the top of the Catholics, however, the change of power did not go off without some loss of blood.

Shortly after the beginning of the reign, Justin, Justinian and Vitalian had guaranteed each other safety by a sacred oath in the church of St. Euphemia of Chalcedon, the former meeting place of the Council, and took communion thereupon. The papal confidant Vitalian, "our highly famous brother," as Justinian wrote in a letter to Hormisdas, had long since been pursuing unification with Rome, was more popular than Justinian himself as a fighter for the faith, and was therefore feared by him. He gained great influence and rose to the highest dignities. He quickly became magister militum praesentis, consul in 520. But still in July of the same year, Justinian, whose entire policy was focused on the succession, had Vitalian murdered along with some other officers at a festivity in the palace – perhaps not by soldiers, but by radical Monophysites.²¹

This end of his "beloved son" by his other "beloved son" will not have grieved His Holiness very much. She did not protest, of course. On the other hand, Hormisdas urged the emperor, in the matter of the reconciliation, "not to leave his hand from the completion of the work, nor to be more lax in his

resolution because of the opposition of some." Under no circumstances should "against salvation the will of the subjects be yielded to". Even Justin, as early as September 9, 520, lamented the pope's severity, reminding him that one of his predecessors, Anastasius (p. 336), had been much more tolerant.²²

364 Justinian I.
Rome passes from Ravenna to Byzantium.

The overthrow under Justin gradually brought about, as much for political reasons as for religious ones, a worsening relationship between Byzantium and Ravenna. The antigothic trend, which had been secret during the king's lifetime but was well recognized by him, put considerable pressure on him in the end and led to the reconquest of Italy by Justinian under his hapless successors.

All this was in the nature of things and was obviously planned from the beginning, however much the Goths were lulled at first. Thus Justin not only adopted Theoderic's son and heir to the throne, Eutharic, but also held the consulship of 519 together with him. However, all authoritative men of the new government, Justin, Vitalian, Justinian, had already conspired with the pope before the overthrow, obviously also wanted an alliance with him. And "From the church peace of Justin a straight path leads to the Gothic war of Justinian" (Rubin). For, of course, the "church peace" meant no real peace, but a peace only between those who are of good will (cf. p. 144 f)! For the rest, however, it was a fighting alliance between Byzantium and Rome, which now changed fronts.²³

Justin, committed Catholic, had immediately revealed the henoticon and thus removed the main obstacle between the Catholics of Italy and the emperor. The papacy, hitherto compliant with the tolerant Gothic "heretic king" and at least benefiting from him, now leaned strongly toward Byzantium, as did the Roman Senate; while Theoderic, much too late, began to control the Catholics more sharply. If before there had been a front Gothic Empire and Rome against Byzantium, now the much more dangerous front Rome and Byzantium formed against the Goths. Contemporaries in the early 6th century still saw the center of the world in the absolutist Christian Byzantine Empire. At first, Justin had accommodated the "barbarians," had made concessions to the Arian Goths in the east, and had exempted them from the general

Rome passes from Ravenna to Byzantium- 365 "heretic" pogroms. But then he retracted this concession and also persecuted those who had hitherto been tolerated. Since the turn of the year 524/25 he rigorously proceeded against the Goths of other faiths. Arian churches were closed, confiscated, converted into Catholic ones, their large properties were confiscated for the Catholics, the Arians were excluded from public offices, from the army, many were forcibly converted. Mass conversions occurred, and Theoderic intervened.²⁴

Unfortunately, he made use of the pope.

Hormisdas was no longer alive. He had died on August 6, 523, and was buried in St. Peter's - the epitaph placed on him by his own son, later Pope Silverius. But even his immediate successor, John I (523-526), of whom history knows little, the more so the legend, felt little desire to ask for tolerance for the damned "heretics" in Constantinople, as Theoderic himself had done towards the Catholics of Italy, even if the atmosphere between Rome and Ravenna had cooled noticeably since 519. So Pope John, already a sick man, traveled to Constantinople, where he stayed from November 525 until after Easter 526. He was triumphantly received, celebrated, and behind it all, of course, was the desire for religious unity as well as the unity of the empire. Theoderic had made a diplomatic mistake, probably misjudged the pope and the papacy altogether. But things probably would not have developed differently anyway. The emperor sank down before the priest "as if he were St. Peter himself." The Roman report even claims that the ruler "adoravit" (adored) Pope John. The latter also immediately worked a miracle by making a blind man see, but otherwise had little success - for the king of "heretics" and "barbarians". His success as pope, on the other hand, was tremendous, indeed, the pope's biographer has him "achieve

everything" with the emperor. Justin, while releasing the confiscated churches, repudiated the return of the forced converts to Arianism, certainly in agreement with John. When the latter, ill and weakened from the journey to Ravenna

j66 Justinian I and died there shortly after on May 18, 526, Catholic legend transfigured his inglorious end at the court of the "heretic" king by a terrible imprisonment, by martyrdom. Before his deathbed, senators and people were already clamoring for relics. At the burial another miracle happens. And already in his epitaph in the vestibule of St. Peter's Basilica in Rome, the "Bishop of the Lord" figures as "Christ's sacrifice". The Liber Pontificalis calls him "martyr" – while the "heretical king", according to the papal biographer, "flew into a rage and wanted to strangle all Italy with the sword"; a telling image! (Later Christian legends demonize Theoderic. In contrast, at the end of the century Pope Gregory I already records miracles worked by John during his lifetime. And Bishop Gregory of Tours, who fabricated one book of miracles after another, finally reports that the furious persecutor of Catholics, Theoderic, threw the pope bound into the dungeon. "I will refrain you from murmuring against our sect henceforth," and "under many torments" "the saint of God" gives up his spirit.)²⁵ Christian historiography!

In the following year 527, Justin passed a "heretic" law that practically deprived all non-Catholics of civil existence. For: "Those who do not worship God in the right way shall also be deprived of human goods". But anyone who did not belong to the Catholic Church was considered a "heretic". The following are also explicitly mentioned: Manichaeans, Samaritans, Jews and Hellenes, i.e. pagans.²⁶ Early Crusades 367

Early crusades or all kinds of

ARAB-ETHIOPIAN SALVATION STORIES

Already a kind of crusade led Justin to South Arabia, whereby it was probably more about commercial than about mission, ergo – with Nietzsche – the higher piracy already at that time, nothing more ... In South Arabia, an offensive of Christian Abyssinia resulted in the persecution of Christians and the destruction of churches by King Yusuf (Dhū Nuwās), a fanatical Jewish proselyte. His opponent 'Ella 'A?beha, ruler of Abyssinia and a Monophysite Christian, called the "Christian king," had attacked Yusuf in 522 but was defeated in two engagements. Yūsuf now barbarically "cleansed" his country of Christian missionaries, traders, informers, also had 300 voluntarily surrendering soldiers of the Christian invading army, despite sacred oaths by Adonai, the Torah, the Law, cut down, almost as many burned alive in the main church of Zhafār. Negus 'Ella 'Asbeha purged Abyssinia of Yūsuf's agents. Yūsuf sought help from the Persian Great King; 'Ella 'Asbeha, who was intensively expanding his fleet in particular, from Emperor Justin, who urged him to attack by land and sea "the vile, unrestrained Jew." Behind the disputes were obviously commercial interests, as Abyssinian Christianity had also emerged from commercial colonies. The strict Catholic emperor and fierce Monophysite persecutor even asked the Alexandrian patriarch Timotheos, a Monophysite to whom the Ethiopian church was jurisdictional, for friendly sponsorship of his diplomatic mission to the Monophysite Negus, and he found the patriarch as willing as the Negus himself, who received the church leader's blessings and a considerable number of the emperor's troopships.²⁷

Negus 'Ella 'Asbeha first sent an army of supposedly 15,000 knights of the faith toward southern Arabia in the winter of 524/25, but after a 22-day march in a waterless desert, they were

368 Justinian I perished without a sound. The main force marched to the coast after a solemn service shortly after Pentecost 525, with on the way the pillar saint Pantaleon, who lived 45 years standing vigil praying on a tower on the top of a mountain (apparently to be as close to God as possible), prophesied victory and blessed the Negus again. On the arrival of the invasion fleet in Arabia – by far the most ships, sixty, had been provided by Byzantine, Persian and Abyssinian merchants – the assault troops

received the Lord's Supper, monks assisted them in rowing to the landing, and since not only the Archangel Gabriel but also the Stylite Pantaleon now appeared to the Ethiopians, Yūsuf was defeated, especially since his own had also betrayed him. He and the leaders who remained loyal to him jumped over the Christian blades. Then Negus 'Ella 'Asbeha seized Yūsuf's family and treasures in Zhafār, his capital, and for seven months ruthlessly plundered the country, in which churches suddenly sprang up, and so oppressed the population that they tattooed crosses on their bodies to escape the Negus' terror. South Arabia lost its independence and got Christian governors. 'Ella 'Asbeha, however, is still a saint of the church today, indeed, stands almost "at the top of the interest of the Western Christian world in the Arab-Ethiopian salvation experiences" (Rubin)?⁸

Judaism, which as so often, so also in Abyssinia probably belonged to the forerunners of Christianity, could no longer maintain itself there after its victory. At the turn of the 7th century, Christian fanatics forced the Jews to emigrate.^{2'}

In another attempt at expansion in the East, Emperor Justin practiced what would become a classic method, a basic rule of Christian statesmanship even in modern colonial times: first he proceeded missionarily, through the use of clergy and baptismal waters; then diplomatically; and in about the last year of his reign he sent troops. In this way Byzantium created for itself in the Caucasus, with its important passes, a permanent and

Emperor Justinian - Ruler of the Church 369

important buffer zone in the Caucasus with its important passes by advancing as far as present-day Georgia, whereby not only strategic but also strong commercial interests played a role.³⁰

The Georgians were under Persian suzerainty, but had been Christians since the 4th century and had frequent disputes with the representatives of the Mazdaist fire religion. Eventually, the rebellious Christians, directed by their clergy, called Emperor Justin to their aid, which was undoubtedly arranged with him. He first sent a Hunnic army under the magister militum Petrus, who was supposed to fight "with all his might" but achieved nothing and was recalled 5x6. However, soon after, the young commanders Sittas and Beïsar operated on the eastern border - supported also by Saracens of the Arab prince Taphar. The Christian fighters first took a lot of slaves and booty, then, of course, due mainly to an ingenious system of obstacles, pitfalls and "Spanish horsemen" of the Persians, two bad defeats at Thannuris and at Melabas.³¹

In the meantime, Emperor Justin had died on August 1, 5x7, at the age of 75 or 77, from a reopened arrow wound in the foot, whereupon he was succeeded in the regency by his nephew Justinian, at first resolutely dissuaded by the ailing ruler, who had not yet wanted to relinquish the helm of state. But he had probably always been the spiritus rector of Justinian's policy.³²

Emperor Justinian - Ruler of the Church

Justinian I (5x7-565), like Uncle Justin a Macedonian peasant's son but exquisitely educated, is 45 years old at the beginning of his reign. A Pycnian, of medium height, round-faced, bald at an early age, probably a Dinaric type, a man full of contradictions and enigmas, then and now demigod and Satan according to his point of view. In him are combined spiritual vigilance with

37° Justinian I almost unique diligence, distrust and envy. He was thorough, energetic, also rabulistic and hypocritical, a heedless schemer. He

ate little and sometimes fasted for days. He wanted to do everything himself - a detail-oriented obsessive creator, sometimes to the point of pedantry. He slept little, the "sleepless emperor", allegedly often only one hour - the "most vigilant of all emperors". Every night he is said to have debated with bishops and holy men. He "always sits talking at night without being guarded," claims Procopius, the famous model of Byzantine historiography, in his "Secret History," "and wants to fathom the riddles of Christianity with old priests in a pointed way." He hardly ever leaves the palace and rules the world

from his desk, so to speak. With the help of his generals Belisarius and Narses, he forces the reconquest and Catholicization of the West. Three quarters of his almost forty-year reign are war years. In doing so, he feels himself God's representative on earth and thus, of course, the Lord of the Church, like every emperor from the early to the late Byzantine period, while the patriarch is only the court bishop, his servant – like every patriarch, every pope. His signature he calls "divine", his property, himself "sacred" (the popes soon adopted this "sacredness"), all the buildings of his palace are sanctified – remember Constantine I, the Savior, Redeemer, who called himself "Our Divinity" (I 241 ff).

As Justinian was politically restlessly active, so also theologically, and this in such a way that one could say that he missed his profession. Of course, only for some he is an expert, for others a kind of unfortunate lover of theology, an amateur. Although a Catholic almost to the end of his life, adhering to the teachings of Rome, not without opportunistic zigzags, he nevertheless feels himself the legislator of the Church, its lord and master. He sets the dates for synods, he reserves the right to convene an ecumenical council, and he equates synod canons with state laws. He decides problems of faith on his own authority, issues decrees of faith. He occupies

Justinian emulates the humility of Christ after 371 the bishop's chairs, as it suits him, in the East, however, no longer unusual. But he is not only an ecclesiastical legislator, he not only decrees "How bishops and other clergy should be admitted to ordination", "What kind of life the monks should lead" et cetera, but he is also a theological author, even composes hymns. Especially in his old age he insists more and more clearly on theology. He built the Hagia Sophia and allegedly paid 310,000 pounds of gold for it. During his reign, churches and monasteries sprang up in all provinces; he was an almost more passionate builder than Constantine I. Justinian, who strove for the restoration of the empire, was not only the ruler of the Catholic Church, but was also recognized as such by the Roman bishop and the city of Rome. Since Pelagius I (556–561), the West must obtain imperial confirmation of the election before consecrating the pope.³³

Justinian emulates Christ's humility, ORDERS "THE WARS GOOD AND THE SPIRITUAL MATTERS ..."

In Justinian's empire, stretching from the Persian Gulf to Spain, politics and faith belong inseparably together; indeed, in addition to his organizational activity and warfare, religious policy occupies a special, extended place with this emperor, who felt himself pardoned, not to say inspired, as a divine scholar. The Byzantine idea of empire does not know any separation of powers between state and church! Rather, the emperor is the supreme head of the church as well. He is not in it, but above it. He regulates ecclesiastical, cultic, theological questions, the fight against the "heresies", the pagans as well as any (other) state or military things. "Every high mass in the church of St. Sophia, in which the emperor took part, bore the stamp of a political

of Justinian I.

Demonstration—just as the acts of state in the sacred palace hardly differed from a high mass. The blending of the secular and spiritual spheres characterized the Byzantine state" (Rubin). The ruler here was Christ responsible for orthodoxy, for the church, the kingdom of Christ on earth; he was "virtually the embodiment of this kingdom, the mediator between Christ and humanity," "the Vicar of Christ" (Dölger).³⁴

At the beginning of the Codex Justinianus are the ecclesiastical laws. 13 titles speak of the faith, the church, the bishops. The very first law contains a formal profession of faith. The next begins, "Being unconditionally devoted to the Savior and Lord of the world Jesus Christ, our true God, we strive, as far as the human mind can, to emulate his humility and condescension." (Coming from a Justinian, one of the greatest autocrats of all time, admittedly also one of the most hypocritical, this sounds particularly curious). 34 Titles of the later novellas are again on canon law.³⁵

Even at the beginning of his reign, in a law of March 1, 528, it says: "We direct all care to the most holy churches for the glory of the holy, inviolable, and consubstantial Trinity, trusting to save Ourselves and the state through them." And to the Patriarch he wrote at the time, "We turn all care to the most holy churches, through which we confidently assert our kingdom, and fortify public life thanks to the grace of God, the man-loving." ³⁶

In the introduction to the VI Amendment of March 16, 535, the monarch writes that to the supreme goodness of Heaven men owe two sublime gifts of God: the episcopate and the imperial power. The latter serves the divine things, the latter guides the worldly. "Both come from one and the same source, and they are the ornament of human existence. Therefore, nothing is so dear to the emperors as reverence for the episcopate, since, conversely, the bishops are obliged to pray perpetually for the emperors". ³⁷

Privileging the Bishops and Fleecing the Laity 373

The old song: throne and altar, which here, however, merge as it were, are one. Which is why the ruler can also put faith first out of full conviction. Thus, his edict of faith addressed to the people of Constantinople on April 4, 544, assures them: "We consider the first and highest good of all people to be the right confession of the true, unadulterated Christian faith, so that it may show its strength everywhere and that all the most holy priests of the world may unite in the same conviction, unanimously confess the true Christian faith, and that all excuses invented by heretics may be eradicated". ³⁸

Justinian also endowed the canons of the four "ecumenical" councils with the force of law (Nov. 131.1). However, Christian influence is often still evident outside of any ecclesiastical legislature, suddenly emphasizing in the midst of the most "profane" decrees, such as a resolution against the excessive playing of dice, that he "order[ed] wars well and spiritual affairs ...". In a prohibition of homosexuality, he refers not to relevant passages of his law books, but to the Old Testament. (Very many "corrupters of men" [zonaras] he punished by cutting off their private parts!) ³⁹

Privileging of the bishops and fleecing of the laity.

As lord of the imperial church, Justinian increased the influence of the bishops, already considerable. Their immunities and status rights were considerably extended. They received almost full *privilegium fori*. The emperor exempted them from the compulsion to take the oath of witnesses, also from being summoned to appear before a civil or military court without his special permission; while, on the other hand, he still extended their own jurisdiction over the clergy from ecclesiastical to civil cases. Yes, the increase in the power of the bishops extended to

374 Justinian I to the general administration as a whole. They acted as the ruler's supervisory authority, especially in financial management, raising taxes, food and transportation. They were also given control over the prisons. They already participated in the election of all the authorities of their place of residence. They acquired arbitral functions even against a governor in the case of his real or suspected disobedience of justice or in a dispute in which he was personally involved; they had to report to the emperor on the conduct of the governors. In short, the bishop became the real head of a city, gaining greater authority than a secular governor.

The emperor also guaranteed the bishopric property. He further gave the church the right to bequeaths that were intended by the testator for only vaguely religious purposes. Such legacies had to benefit the heir in the short term and could then be collected at any time, with a limitation period of one hundred years. Gifts to the church remained free of acquisition tax. The more than one thousand business enterprises of the "Great Church" of Constantinople were also completely exempt from tax. On the other hand, no church property was allowed to be used for secular purposes, except for the ransom of prisoners.

Of course, the clergy also made extensive propaganda for the regent who favored it so immensely. It also participated in every major crime committed by the state. It supported, directly or indirectly, the enormous wars of the emperor as well as his enormous exploitation of the subjects, not least the rich ones.

Quite significant also: the further disempowerment of the people within the church itself. Whereas previously, at least in pre-Constantine times and even later, the people had participated in the election of bishops, this was now restricted to the nobles of the city. Only the clergy and the local notables were to determine the bishop. But in practice, the government had a constant say in filling the most important chairs, in case of

privileging of the bishops and fleecing of the laity 375

it did not immediately remove candidates it disliked and appoint those it liked, especially in

Constantinople. Even for the election of the

pope, imperial confirmation became obligatory. The consecration fees were considerable, at least twenty pounds of gold for patriarchs; but the illegal rates are said to have been significantly higher.⁴¹

Justinian, who promoted the bishops where he could, was often lenient with corrupt ministers, generals, and officials, and was often sociable with nobles in general, continued to suck the masses dry, harshly oppressed the people, relentlessly tightened the tax screw, not without, to all appearances, the very special participation of the empress, and ruined, also with her help, countless empires.

The Byzantine chroniclers agree on this. At least, the greed for money and covetousness of the most Christian imperial house is the main theme of the oppositional literature.

In his scandalous "Secret History", published only posthumously, Procopius, the most outstanding literary representative of the time, writes: "Justinian sought the wealth of others and bloodshed with insatiable greed. Having deprived the richest families of their property, he sought out other people to make them equally miserable." Prokop reports classic gangster plays, tells how Justinian played along with the merchants, the sailors, and also does not pass over "what the emperor did with the shekels. In the past, the money changers paid 210 pholes for one stater of gold. Justinian, however, ordered that in the future only 180 pholes should be given for it, and in this way he gained the sixth part in each gold piece." ⁴²

The Byzantine ecclesiastical historian Euagrius Scholasticus, an Antiochian lawyer who wrote an ecclesiastical history in six books for the period from 431 to 594, the main source of the Christological disputes, and from a strictly Catholic point of view, also informs us that "Justinian was possessed of an insatiable greed for money and was so lustful for other people's property that he gave his entire empire to the officials of

Justinian 1.

and tax collectors and all those who wanted to lay snares for the people without reason, for money.

Many, even countless rich people he robbed of all their property under cheap pretexts ... He did not spare money, so that he built everywhere many and splendid holy churches and other pious houses for the care of boys and girls, old men and old women, and those afflicted with various diseases." ⁴³

Church historian Euagrius also drastically illustrates an evil trait of Justinian's, touched on earlier, by which he "surpassed the mentality of a beast": criminal indulgence of his minions, in this case the Catholic circus party of the "Blues" (the opponents of the Monophysite "Greens"). Both were sporting, but – long unrecognized – also political organizations, and as carriers and representatives of the people "played a very significant role in all the major cities of the Empire" (Ostrogorsky). According to Euagrius, the strict Catholic, the emperor supported the "Blues" in such a way "that they assassinated their opponents in the middle of the day and in the middle of the city and not only did not have to fear any punishment, but were even given gifts. As a result, many people became murderers. They were also

free to enter the houses and plunder the valuables kept there and sell the people the salvation of their bare lives for money. And if an official tried to put a stop to it, he risked his own life. When a comes Orientis deservedly hanged some insurgents, he was hanged and dragged around in the middle of the city itself. When the ruler of the province of Cilicia brought two Cilician murderers named Paulos and Faustinos, who attacked and tried to kill him, to their legal punishment, he was crucified and thus received the punishment for his reasonable and lawful attitude. Therefore, the followers of the other party had fled, and being received by no man, and wandering about everywhere like curse-laden criminals, they waylaid the travelers, performed robberies and murders, and everywhere Privileging of the bishops and fleecing of the laity 377

threatened uncertain death, plunder, and other crimes. Sometimes it turned into the opposite, and delivered to the severity of the law those whom he had let loose on the cities to commit outrages after the manner of barbarians. For a detailed report words are too weak and time too short. This suffices to allow us to infer the rest as well. "43

And the historian John Zonaras, who was active only in the 12th century and who, after his service as commander of the emperor's bodyguard and head of his chancellery, retired as a monk to the princely island of Hagia Glykeria (Niandro), reports about Justinian: "This emperor was very accessible, but had an open ear for slander, was harsh and swift in his revenge, did not use money sparingly, but lavishly, and showed himself unsparing in collecting it. Partly he spent it on buildings, partly he satisfied his random desires with it, partly he threw it out for wars and for fighting against all who opposed his wishes".44

Justinian himself (apparently) saw it all quite differently. At least he vows, "All days and nights WE will always spend without sleep and in worry, to give to the subjects what is beneficial and pleasing to God. WE do not take this restlessness uselessly upon US, but let it serve in daily labor plans by which OUR subjects may reap prosperity free from all fear, while WE take upon US the cares of them all. "45 But a few more or less naïve panegyrists aside (such as the poet Paulos Silentiarios, John Lydos with, however, still some critical tones just on domestic politics, and Justinian's presumed teacher Agapetos, deacon at Hagia Sophia), the historians repeatedly paint the emperor as a ruthlessly exploitative despot. And neither the similarity of the accusations against him nor insufficient justifications in individual cases, writes Berthold Rubin, change anything "about the fact that they were mostly justified. This must be acknowledged in spite of all the factual errors, stan-

378 Justinian I, party-political, and confessional shifts of emphasis, this must be said. "46

Justinian's finance minister was the praefectus praetorio John of Cappadocia. Rising from the simplest classes, he had the thankless task of sucking for his master what could be sucked. He is said to have tortured cattle and to have ruined entire provinces with his fronts. Extremely hated, he was all the more in favor with the emperor, as he needed more and more money, the tax policy thus became more and more important, he began to double and then triple the taxes soon after the start of his reign. John, however, was inexhaustible in inventing new methods of fleecing and, moreover, provoked the population with his well-known drinking and love orgies, his public appearance and his complete harem. Nevertheless, he tried, albeit in vain, to limit the violence of the big agrarians. Such important researchers as Ostrogorsky, Johannes Haller speak of his positive administrative work, call him the great minister, the most serious opponent of Theodora, Justinian's wife, by whom John lost his offices in 543 and on whose name the ruler himself used to swear on solemn occasions after her end of life.47

Theodora - mistress of houseboys, patriarchs (?) and wife of the emperor.

She undoubtedly had the greatest influence on him. "They did nothing without each other," Prokop notes two years after her death, though this applies more to the emperor than to her. Theodora, a petite, always elegant little person, slender, pale, with large black, lively looking eyes, spirited, not without

spirit and enormously strong-willed, more energetic probably than her husband, sat beside him for twenty-one years not only on the throne. Was she, after all, a kind of vice-emperor, co-regent, and gele-.

Theodora - Wife of the Emperor 379 gentlich she ruled perhaps more than Justinian himself. She proudly wrote to the Persian king's minister, "The emperor never decides anything without asking me."^{*8}

Theodora was the daughter of a bear keeper at the Hippodrome. According to Prokop, she is said to have committed unnatural fornication with the boys of distinguished circus visitors already as a little girl, then to have performed "obscene page services" in a public house, yes, to have given herself up more than forty times in a single orgy. Prokop had to conceal many things, as he confesses, "for fear of spies, of the revenge of the powerful, of the cruelest death penalty," but he loved to paint the black in his infamous "Secret History" (*Historia arcana*). It bristles with unbridled hatred of Justinian and Theodora, whom he ("and most of us") considered to be true nightmare, incarnate figures of hell, devils in human form, which he illustrates through numerous gruesome anecdotes. After all, all this comes from an avowed patriot who is basically quite loyal to the empire. And with what tremendous rhetoric, what inexhaustible vocabulary, with what cloudbursts of outrageous, not infrequently also unbelievable invective and dissolute imagination he always castigates the policy of the most Christian imperial couple, his criticism hardly misses the core of the matter. He also reports of two children and the constant abortions of Theodora, soon so propagating discipline and chastity. Feil, würdelos, geil calls her a modern historian, a real "world city mixture of Rüpeldirne, female clown and cabaret artist" (Rubin) - and still today her puzzle eyes stare unfathomably dark from the mosaics of Ravenna.*⁹

An actress activity - allegedly also in the theater "to the whores" - that exhausted itself in comic pantomimes and living pictures, ended Theodora by going through with the African provincial governor Hekebolos, who, however, soon gave her the run again - not to her detriment. For after presumably being once again in the deepest gutter, she, on an intimate basis, soon consorted only with

380 Justinian I.

High and Highest; probably with the Monophysite Patriarch Timotheos III of Alexandria, her "spiritual father," whom she remembered gratefully throughout her life; and thereafter perhaps with the Patriarch Severos of Antioch, who took her over from Timotheos. Then Justinian fell in love with her, ennobled and married this graceful, tough, instinct-hunted "female tiger", read his every wish from his eyes and laid half the world at his feet. Very rarely, probably, in the region of highest power there were two people so made for each other. "The state system became fuel for the fire of this love" (Prokop).⁵⁰

Theodora also shared with Justinian his passion for theology and religious politics. Unlike him, however, an apparently fanatical advocate of the Council of Chalcedon, she adhered to the Monophysites, even before her accession, perhaps out of an old love for the patriarch Timotheos, her "spiritual father." This earned her a lot of incense from Monophysite theologians, who even lied about her origin, that she was born as the daughter of a Monophysite priest, and that at her death all the churches resounded with her fame. Possibly she really believed - already the contemporaries rumored all sorts of things - what she represented. From the very beginning, Christianity divided those who were close to each other, separated children from their parents, a man from his wife, and was relentlessly promoted by the clergy (1152 ff). Perhaps, however, Justinian and Theodora, as Emperor Anastasios and his followers had already suspected, were merely playing a comedy on the world, cynically playing a trick on it, perfidiously agreeing, one to the two natures of the Lord, the other to the one nature, i.e. each to one of the two great Christian communities, in order to bind them both to the imperial house.⁵¹

Theodora even founded monasteries from which Monophysite missionaries went out. And, as everyone

knew, including her husband, she gave shelter to many prelates of such provenance in her palace. The patriarch Anthimus, whom Justinian in 535, during a Monophysite phase of his politics, had elected to the throne of

Theodora - consort of the emperor in 381 Constantinople, in the following year, with consideration for the pope and apparently also for his war plans in Italy, was already fired again, was only brought out twelve years later at her death.⁵²

Thus, as the emperor's wife, the city-famous hetaera had suddenly become pious and chaste. She had an open hand for churches and convents, advocated marriage laws, regulated nightlife, indeed, she now sought to re-educate the prostitutes of Constantinople in a "house of penance," more than five hundred women and girls, paying five gold pieces per person. Most are said to have thrown themselves into the sea out of desperation. Anyway, asceticism, frustration now turned into inhumanity in Theodora. For while she used to enjoy coiting for her life, she now enjoyed being tortured for her life. Every day she went to the drudgery chambers and greedily watched the tortures. "If you do not carry out my orders," was her favorite saying, "I swear by Him who is eternal that I will have the skin whipped off your back."⁵³

Undoubtedly, Theodora, whose despotism, whose love and above all hatred exceeded all measure, who almost addictively pushed her enemies into banishment, dungeon, death, into every ignominy and disgrace, who unrestrainedly hunted down even favorites of the emperor, who is also said to have instigated the state show trials against alleged homos of the upper classes - undoubtedly she was a hundred times more temperamental than her crowned lord, who betrayed neither anger nor indignation towards the very highest offenders, if Prokop is to be believed: "but mild of countenance, with gently lowered eyebrows and lowered voice, he ordered thousands of innocent people to be killed, cities to be destroyed, and all property to be annexed to the state treasury. With such a character, the man could have been taken for a lamb." After all, this was the same man whose piety was universally praised, who was called "divinus", whose law and palace were called "sacer" and "sanctus", who was apostrophized as the most pious prince (piissimus), who could also write himself: "The
j8z Justinian I.

Emperor, who based his rule on the holy religion, reigns thanks to the grace of our Lord in temporality", he has "received the scepter by the goodness of the eternal power".⁵⁴

Such lamb-like composure, then, in the face of more than predatory approaches would hardly have been conceivable in Theodora. But this aside, before she died of cancer in 548 at the age of 52, she was as pompous, as greedy for power and money, as murderous and mendacious, as unquestioning as Justinian himself. Her estates, donated by the emperor, were partly in Asia Minor, in Egypt, and she used to travel, then accompanied by four thousand servants. She squandered insane sums of money in the twinkling of an eye and, having come almost from nothing herself, took representation to the extreme. There was nothing in which she did not have a say, in which she did not intrigue, in the administration, in diplomacy, in the church. It launched its minions into key positions. It made and unmade patriarchs, ministers and generals.⁵⁵

She also made slavish proscynesis a rule and guarded with a wary eye a protocol that forced even the first batches of the court to spend hours in antichambers. She proceeded with imprisonment and exile against all those she disliked; indeed, she appointed special courts in order to be able to cool her revenge more quickly and to increase her gigantic fortune. Prokop reports of a senator close to Beisaris, chained to a manger in the underground dungeon: "The only thing missing from his image of a donkey was the donkey's bray". And of the general Buzes (still today, according to popular belief, quite proven), who is said to have spent more than two years in a lightless dungeon of their palace: "The man, who reproached him for eating every day, consorted like a beast with a beast, mute with the mute". The ever-increasing

confiscations of wealth benefited Theodora in no small measure. In the process, a separate staff of informers and secret service agents pursued her interests, and after her demise the emperor seems simply to have taken over her corps of agents, though not with equal perfidy.⁵⁶

The Nika Revolt 383

As a woman to whom hardly anything was more alien than study of records, scholarly obsession with detail, even pettiness, she, unlike Justinian, naturally found ample time to care for her physical. She could not care enough for her body, says Prokop, who, of course, is the one who speaks the worst of her. She bathed for an unusually long time in the morning and had breakfast, as at all meals, already with all kinds of food and drink. After that, she nursed rest again and slept very long in other ways. "Although the empress was thus addicted to every kind of intemperance, she nevertheless believed she could rule the whole empire in the few hours of the day that remained to her." ⁵⁷

The Nika Revolt

Theodora probably played her greatest role in January 532 in the massive Nika uprising (nika = victory; the slogan of the rebels).

The people's discontent led to the uprising - a last struggle for their freedom. Therefore even the two circus parties of the Greens (Prasinoi) and the Blues (Venetoi) joined forces, the former monophysite, the latter orthodox (p. 376 f). They had already proclaimed another "emperor," Emperor Anastasios' nephew Hypatios, against his will. The "Greens" had taken the initiative, the "Blues" had agreed. Prisons were broken open, the incarcerated freed. Numerous palaces, first the city prefecture, then the Senate building, as well as churches, works of art and the part of the city inhabited by the aristocracy went up in flames. Day and night Constantinople was a smoking desert. Even the imperial court was threatened by fire, and even the Hagia Sophia was looted. The situation seemed hopeless. Justinian, besieged in the residence, was already determined to give up everything, throne and empire, and flee by ship across the Bosphorus. Theodora alone held him back, making the famous statement, "I for my
384 Justinian 1.

Person remain; I love the old maxim that purple is a good shroud."

Beisaris, three veteran regiments brought in by now, and the commander of the bodyguard, the Theodora minion Narses, restored "order" after five days of anarchy: "more than thirty thousand" people, according to Prokop, about thirty-five thousand people, according to John Malalas, a Greekized Antiochian chronicler (probably the later patriarch of Constantinople John Scholasticus), were lured into the circus and there, hour after hour, like a flock of sheep, were stabbed together indiscriminately. John Lydos, the pious eyewitness and fan of the emperor (p. 377), reports with satisfaction as many as fifty thousand dead, Zacharias Rhetor, bishop of Mytilene (first Monophysite, then New Chalcedonian) even eighty thousand. The massacre, even more monstrous than the slaughter in the circus of Thessalonica by the Catholic Theodosius (I 446 ff) transfigured by Augustin, was perhaps less Justinian's atrocity than that of Theodora. In any case: neither of them prevented their Christianity from smothering the riot in a sea of blood. Heads rolled from high and low. Also the head of Hypatios fell, whom Justinian wanted to pardon; likewise that of his brother Pompeios. Eighteen Patrikioi were banished, all their possessions confiscated - and from the rubble rose the cathedrals all the more beautiful. And also Theodora, the mass murderess, as befitted her, rose to be the official co-ruler. Her name appeared in the state documents, above the gates of the barracks - and on the votive tablets of the churches! As even today the Eastern Ecclesia remembers her with honor and gratitude.⁵⁸ Only the "honor of the altars" is still missing - unjustly.

Emperor Justinian persecutes Christians of other faiths in 385

Emperor Justinian persecutes Christians of other faiths

Christians "that they may succumb to misery ..."

Supported by his episcopate, Justinian urged total unity of faith: one empire, one emperor, one church – and thus annihilation of all non-Catholics. Prokop reports that "immediately the whole Roman empire filled with blood sentences, banishment offenses, and fleeing persecuted people." 59

Justinian opened the tyranny, initially still shared with Justin, with a brutal "heretic" persecution, acting first against minor sects: "It is just," the two potentates decreed in 527, "to deprive also of their worldly goods those who do not worship the true God." Religious intolerance drew civil intolerance in its wake. In an uncommonly harsh law, they declared "heretics" "deprived of all earthly benefits, that they may succumb to misery," and enumerated a long series of restrictions and punishments to carry out their pious purpose. 60

And soon the struggle against Monophysites, Manichaeans, Montanists, Arians, Donatists became more and more comprehensive, religious intolerance became "a public virtue" (Diehl). 61

Like his pious predecessor and uncle, Justinian forbade "heretics" from assemblies, worship services, the appointment of clergy, and the ownership of churches, many of which were destroyed under him. He forbade them any kind of teaching activity. He excluded them from all offices and dignities, from the advocacy. In 536 he threatened transcribers of their writings with the loss of their hands. Also, "heretics" could bequeath their property only to Catholics and were themselves incapable of inheritance. Some sects were not allowed to perform any legally valid act at all; but even the remaining "heretics" had "hardly any rights vis-à-vis the judiciary" (Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte). Offenders were threatened with loss of civil rights, confiscation of all property, and in case of recidivism, the death penalty, which was also carried out ruthlessly. The emperor finally imposed it not only for perjury, sorcery, but also for sacrilege, blasphemy, whereby

386 Justinian I.

"heresy" was punished simply as blasphemy, that is, precisely with death. This corresponded to the "inner-church development"; was the "unspiritual solution of a religious problem ..which has repercussions up to the present" (Merkel). 62

In Prokop's "Secret History" (not published under Justinian) one reads about his "heretic" pogroms:

"Hordes of agents immediately roamed the country everywhere and forced whoever they met to give up his inherited faith. Since this seemed an outrage to the peasants, they decided to resist the henchmen with one accord. Many heretics died by the sword, many even committed suicide – in their simplicity they believed they were doing a good deed for God – but the majority fled their homeland. In Phrygia, the Montanists locked themselves in their places of worship, set them on fire, and perished with them without a second thought. The whole Roman Empire was so filled with murder and fear.... , "63

It is called salvation history!

Justinian persecuted by far the largest "heretic" church, the Monophysites, more severely than Justin had done since 519. Police and soldateska took their prayer houses, dozens of bishops were banished or hounded from one hiding place to another, uncounted monks and nuns were expelled, brutalities of all kinds were committed, popular uprisings in Syria under the Catholic patriarch of Antioch, Ephraim (526–544), a former general who carried out forced conversions, cruelly suppressed – the Catholic "Handbook of Church History" calls him "militantly orthodox," the Catholic "Dictionary of Theology and the Church" praises him for his "unusual charity in the earthquake . . .". Similar to Ephraim, a former Pachomian abbot proceeded in Egypt, Paulos of Alexandria, appointed highest imperial official and at the same time patriarch. Justinian had appointed him by virtue of his own authority as a prince of the church, but had him dismissed for too much intrigue, violence – nor complicity in the murder of a deacon laid

Emperor Justinian persecuted Christians of other faiths in 387

He was deposed in 542. At a synod of the imperial city in May/June 536 the ban was imposed on the

patriarchs Severos of Antioch and Anthimus of Constantinople (535-536), confirmed by Justinian, the following of Severos was thrown out of Constantinople; Severos himself fled again to Egypt. All this, of course, was done to Rome's great satisfaction, but against fundamental political interests.⁶⁴

Influenced by Theodora, however, Justinian at times sought opportunities for understanding, which is why periods of persecution alternated with efforts at mediation. As early as 531, the emperor, under Theodora's urging and probably also for reasons of state policy, abandoned the hard line against the Monophysites. After the Nika rebellion, he adopts the Monophysite-friendly so-called Theopaschite formula "one of the Trinity suffered in the flesh" as a reconciliation formula, which Pope John II also sanctions on March 25, 534! In 535 Theodora brings the Monophysites Theodosios and Anthimus to the patriarchal chairs of Alexandria and Constantinople, which, of course, immediately provokes the protest of Pope Agapet, who visits the court in the spring of the next year, whereupon Anthimus has to abdicate, his leading following has to leave the capital, and Justinian intensifies the persecution of the Monophysites – at times there are only three of their bishops in the whole empire. Yes, according to Monophysite reports, Orthodox bishops even burned Monophysites at the stake or tortured them to death. In any case, the problem remained unsolved because Justinian could only be emperor of one church, and when he reconquered Italy he also joined, had to join, ever more closely Rome, since he desperately needed the pope and the Italian Catholics. But when he regained Catholic North Africa, Catholic Italy, when the political and military center of gravity shifted again to the East, Emperor Justinian, shortly before his death, went over to the Aph-thartodoketes, the most extreme wing of the Monophysites!⁶⁵

The Monophysite schism spread considerably in part especially by Metropolitan Jacobos, who died in 578 (after whom the West Syrian Monophysites were henceforth called "Ja-cobites"). They create strongholds for themselves and become "national churches" in Syria and Egypt. Of course, they are also persecuted for centuries. Already under Justin II (565-578) new heavy pogroms begin. On Greek territory, the Monophysites are occasionally forced to convert to the Catholic Church, as in Antioch in 1072, where the patriarch of the Melchites, the "orthodox", the "imperial", has the churches of the Monophysites, the Jacobites, destroyed, their priests imprisoned and tortured.⁶⁶

' Among the "heresies" considered particularly bad by Justinian – Montanists, for example, Gnostic Ophites (who gave a central place to the serpent), Borborites (who practiced female communion and were said to have sacrificed and enjoyed the semen obtained by onanism as well as menstrual blood for the redemption of the light germs, souls, contained therein) – were, of course, the Manichaeans, among others. Like the Borborites, they also sought to prevent the procreation of humanity; the Manichaeans through propagated planned contraception.⁶⁷

Like many church leaders – here shown in detail by the example of Pope Leo I (p. 263 ff) – and many Christian emperors, especially Valentinian I, Valens, Theodosius I and II, Justinian also persecuted the Manichaeans relentlessly, he worse than all his predecessors. At first, to be sure, he debated with them in order to refute them. But they defended their doctrines "with satanic tenacity" and many died for it. Thus, as early as 527, Justinian threatened the "accursed" Manichaeans with expulsion and capital punishment throughout the empire. Also, any converted Manichaean who still maintained contacts with his comrades, much less anyone who converted back to their faith, had forfeited his life.⁶⁸

Nevertheless, the emperor could not particularly weaken the sect, let alone destroy it; indeed, he could not even prevent its further spread. And, grotesquely, almost implausibly:

For Pagans "a kind of inquisitorial trial," 389 he himself, around 540, made the Syrian moneychanger Petros Barsymes, who had been sponsored by Theodora, the supreme financial head of his empire and, in 543, the praetorian prefect—a man who, if Prokop is to be believed, quite openly confessed his leading

position with the Manichaeans and yet continued to hold high offices of state even after Theodora's death.⁶

For pagans "a kind of inquisitional trial".

Stubbornly, Justinian continued the fight against paganism. Already outlawed as a *crimen publicum* for two hundred years, it was still not dead. It lived in remote or border areas, in the Syrian desert, the mountains of Anatolia, the Libyan oasis of Augila, on the Nile island of Phi-lae, but also and especially in learned circles, in the best society of Constantinople.

In a first anti-pagan decree – undated and without indication of origin, but attributed to Justinian by recent scholars – he orders, in addition to the harsh earlier laws, to investigate pagan worship. He also prohibits donations and wills in favor of pagans. Another decree, undoubtedly from Justinian, particularly attacks sacrificial worship and "unholy" festivals. And beyond the earlier legislation, which sought to destroy the pagan cult and the legal capacity of its associations, Justinian now wants to roll it up, so to speak,

in its entirety: he orders the forced baptism of every pagan, together with his family, under penalty of confiscation. Those who resist lose their civic rights and all their movable and immovable property.

Teachers of the old faith were forbidden to teach, denied a state salary, and their property was confiscated; they themselves had to go into exile. Thus, for the first time in history, "a kind of inquisition was imposed on the pagans" (Geffcken).⁷⁰

39° Justinian I.

After another law of the emperor in 529 again forbids pagans as well as other non-Catholics all offices and dignities, also any teaching activity, he opens still in the autumn of the same year numerous processes against religiously renitent officials. He now pressed for complete eradication, both materially and spiritually, in unprecedented persecution (occasionally even beyond the borders). Although most of the anti-pagan laws already existed, they were now relentlessly serious about their implementation. "We cannot bear to watch this disorder quietly," it was said in 529, when the Academy of Athens, the last great pagan university, was also closed, all its property taken away, and the teaching of philosophy forbidden forever. The most important Athenian thinkers, including Damaskios, the head of the Academy, emigrated to the Persian Empire, but apparently, contrary to common opinion, returned. The last ancient sanctuaries of Egypt were closed or, like the famous temple of Jupiter Ammon in the Libyan desert, converted into Christian churches, all pagans declared incapable of validly performing any legal act. Their immediate forced baptism was ordered, including infants, with the emperor's ecclesiastical confidant and agent, the Syrian John of Amida, later bishop of Ephesus, a Monophysite, alone expanding the Kingdom of God in the Asia Minor provinces of Asia, Caria, Lydia and Phrygia, as he boasted himself, by 70–80,000 new Christians, 96 new churches and 12 monasteries – not without massive coercion and bribery: the emperor is said to have paid a bounty. Death penalty was ordered for offering sacrifices, for worshipping pagan images, death penalty for returning Christians to paganism, death penalty finally also for anyone who is himself a Christian but does not co-Christianize his household.⁷¹

Since paganism persisted longest in the more cultivated East, especially in educated circles, the persecution in Constantinople itself affected many members of the highest social classes, philosophers, high state officials, senators, doctors, against whom action was now taken with dismissal, confiscation of goods,

For Jews, "a fate of shame ... "391 torture and death sentences. Grammarians, sophists, lawyers, physicians, all were incarcerated, forcibly converted, whipped, and occasionally executed. Statues of gods and pagan books were publicly burned, as in June 559 on the Kynegion, after the captured "idolaters" were dragged through the city. All the unbaptized, indeed, as we shall now see, even all

Christians outside the Catholic Church, were just completely without rights and were severely punished for the slightest religious activity.⁷²

For Jews, "a fate of shame ..."

At times, imperial beaules and bishops also raged against the Jews, whose religion had long been considered *religio licita*. In his new version of Roman law, the *Codex Justinianus*, however, Justinian eradicated the principle of the Theodosian Code that the Jewish religion was a permitted religion. "Two hundred years of Christian rule were enough to push Judaism into illegality" (Stemberger). The ruler now does not distinguish the Jews at all from pagans and "heretics", but puts them on the same level with them, after the occasional process admittedly already of Theodosius II (p. 48 ff), which must have sounded horrible to Jewish ears.⁷³

An imperial novella of 537 is addressed thus to the prefect John of Cappadocia: "Your Eminence has lately made known to me that Jews, Samaritans, Montanists, or other vile people are among the *curiae*, whom even now our true and blameless faith has not enlightened, but who sit in darkness and with their souls do not perceive the true mysteries, and since we hate heretics, for this reason they believe themselves to be free from curial obligations ..." The Emperor, surprised that his prefect did not immediately "tear apart" all who think so,

decrees for all of them to remain in the *Curia* and to render services and payments (*munera*), but at the same time does not concede to them any privilege of the other *curiales*. Rather, in honors "they shall enjoy none, but shall suffer a fate according to the disgrace in which they also choose to leave their souls".⁷⁴

Justinian squeezed the Jews socially and legally. They were no longer allowed to acquire ecclesiastical objects, neither church property nor land that could be used for church building, and in no way Christian slaves. If they did the latter, they had to release the slaves and pay a fine of 30 pounds. Any activity that required slave ownership was thus almost impossible for Jews. The emperor was also the first to declare them incapable of acting as witnesses against a Catholic. Only if the latter argued with a non-Catholic were they allowed to serve as a witness for the Catholic.⁷⁵

For Africa, where Jews were hunted like Donatists, which repeatedly contributed to great uprisings, the monarch issued a particularly rigorous anti-Jewish law in 535. He commanded that synagogues should not continue as such, but should be converted into churches – thus for the first time fundamentally removing the state protection guaranteed to existing synagogues and preventing their religious practice altogether.⁷⁶

The "Christianization" of synagogues, like that of pagan temples, had long been in progress. Thus, a synagogue in Edessa became the Church of St. Stephen, in Alexandria in 414 the Church of St. George, in Constantinople by Theodosius II in 442. the Church of St. Mary (Chalcoprate Church), in Daphne in 507 the Church of St. Leon. Later, in 598, Bishop Victor made the synagogues of Palermo into churches. Earlier, John of Ephesus, patriarch of Constantinople under Justinian, had converted seven synagogues into churches in Asia, Caria, Lydia, and Phrygia. Synagogues, like temples, were apparently usually heavily modified before the Christians used them themselves. But it also happened that synagogues were burned or completely razed and then, as at *Apa-meia*, rebuilt with a church.⁷⁷

For Jews, "a fate of shame ... "393

The regent even interfered in purely theological disputes and in the worship practices of the Jews, as in an internal dispute of the synagogue of Constantinople. He enforced permission to read the Torah, the Pentateuch, the five books of Moses in Greek or Latin translation. To this end, he even issued his longest decree for Jews, Novel 146 from 553. He gave certain recommendations for Bible reading, but he also made regulations. For example, the Jews were always to read out the alleged references to Christ in the Scriptures. In contrast, he forbade their own exegesis as found in the Mishnah. He also urged them to

accept the Christian date of Easter.⁷⁸

The church made the emperor's anti-Jewish decrees its own and at numerous synods, for example, inculcated that no Jew should be given an office by which he would become the superior of a Christian. Even where Justinian's code was not adopted, its anti-Jewish part was received indirectly or directly and was widely normative until modern times. "Basically, almost all later ecclesiastical and state laws concerning Jews go back to him and only expand him, according to the respective conditions of time and place. Many of these decrees were adopted by the new states created by the migration of peoples and inculcated by popes and councils" (Browe).⁷⁹

Even more barbarously than against the Jews, the Catholic tyrant proceeded against a particularly weak minority.

394 Justinian I.

Justinian's extermination of the Samaritans

The Samaritans, racially and religiously related to the Jews, were nevertheless traditionally on bad terms with them and were already persecuted in the Jewish revolt under the Christian Gallus (I 324 f). A revolt of the sect had also occurred in 484 under Emperor Zenon. The community elevated a certain Justasas, an alleged gang leader, to king and conquered Caesarea and Neapolis (Nablus, the ancient Sichern), where they invaded the church and cut off the fingers of the celebrating bishop Terebinthos. The uprising was put down by a troop deployment, Justasas was killed, all Samaritan property was seized, a strong garrison was thrown into Neapolis, and its famous synagogue was turned into a Christian monastery. The Samaritans were forbidden to enter Garizim, their holy mountain, and its sanctuary on the summit was remodeled into a church of St. Mary (which was recaptured under Emperor Anastasios but lost again by a Christian counterattack).⁸⁰

Such constant frictions were unforgotten, but relatively minor compared to the outrage of 529. Their deeper causes are seen by older Christian research to be "almost universally" rooted in the sect's "hatred of Christians" (Kautzsch), whereas in reality, as Sabine Winkler's in-depth study shows, it was "the other way around," namely "Christian fanaticism" was behind it with the "intense hatred of the church."⁸¹

The revolt had been preceded by a whole series of very repressive Justinian edicts, including "De Haereticis et Manicheis et Samaritis," wherein the "heretics" along with pagans, Jews, and Samaritans are rigorously charged, wherein the emperor cites all the anti-Heretical decrees of previous Christian rulers and adds new ones. The aforementioned have no right to hold magisterial offices and dignities; no right to sit in judgment on Christians or even bishops; no right to exclude Catholic children from the will, otherwise

Justinian's extermination of the Samaritans 395

the will is invalid; no right to hold legal assemblies, synods, perform baptisms, hire bishops; no right to build monasteries, abbeys, asylums; no right to manage and cultivate lands themselves or through agents, and so on.

The actual cause of the uprising was apparently a decree of 529, which applied only to the Samaritans, a particularly small minority, on whom one wanted to make an example. The Catholic government now ordered the destruction of the Samaritan synagogues, the punishment of all who dared to rebuild them, declared the inability of the Samaritans to make any donations or disposals under penalty of property confiscation, also the inability to inherit; only Catholics were allowed to inherit. Bishops and governors must supervise the measures.⁸²

Some historians consider this last edict (Cod. Just. 1,5,17) to be only the consequence of the elevation. According to Prokop and Chorikios, a 6th century sophist from Gaza, however, it was apparently its cause. The immediate occasion, however, for the conflict was apparently "a custom in the territory of

Palestine" reported by Malalas, the custom of Christian youth to stone the houses and synagogues of the Samaritans on the Sabbath. "On the day of the Sabbath, after the reading of the Gospel, the youth of the Christians came out of the church and proceeded to sing mocking songs in the synagogues of the Samaritans, and threw stones at their houses. For these had the custom of withdrawing and secluding themselves on that day. And at that time (i.e. at the beginning of the rebellion already mentioned by Malalas) they did not like to leave the place to the Christians. When, according to the Holy Gospel, the Christian youth entered the synagogues of the Samaritans and stoned them, the Samaritans rushed out, turned on the invaders, and killed many with the sword. Many youths fled to the altar of St. Basil, which was there, and some of the Samaritans pursued them and killed them in view of the holy altar."

"83

y)6 Justinian I.

The rebellion covered all of Samaria, from the capital of Scythopolis in the east to Caesarea on the coast. But the real heart of the resistance was the highlands of Samaria, where the oppressed crowned one of their own, Julian, probably a Kolon, as king. The Christian sources, standing in official world chronicles, in monk biographies, of course, report completely one-sided, never mentioning the decisive social aspect of the matter and scolding Julian "brigand", "gang leader", "robber chief". Thus, Bishop John of Nikiu (place on an island of the Nile) in his Greek World Chronicle of the end of the 7th century emphasizes the religious-national side of the revolt: "A Samaritan brigand leader gathered around him all the Samaritans and unleashed a great war ... He misled a great number of his people by deceptively assuring them that he was the messenger of God to restore the kingdom of the Samaritans, as Roboam . . . had done, who had reigned after Solomon the Wise, son of David, and who had deceived the people of Israel and led them into idolatry . . .".*

The rising sect burned many places in the vicinity of Scythopolis, devastated cities and large domains, devastated the church of Nicopolis, set fire to that of Bethlehem, killed the bishop of Neapolis, Mammonas, and many priests. They stormed to the front of Jerusalem, as larger contingents of troops were merely on the borders and in the imperial headquarters. Justinian relieves the governor Bassus, has him beheaded, and sends the dux Palaestinae, Theodoros Simos (who is assisted by units of Arab tribes allied with Rome under the Phylarch of Palestine, as the intensity of the rebellion shows), with heavily armed forces. Theodoros pushes the poorly armed rebels, unaccustomed to battle, back to their center, surrounds them, captures Julian, and sends his head along with the crown to Constantinople. They also cut off 20000 Samaritans, to Malalas, 100 000 to Prokop; 50 000, probably mostly colonists, flee to the Persians and offer their assistance in the war against Byzantium

Justinian's extermination of the Samaritans in 397

as well as the delivery of Palestine together with all the treasures of the "Holy City" - nothing is known about the fate of these refugees, their eventual settlement, their participation in campaigns against Eastern Rome. Others are holed up on Mount Garizim or, a refuge since time immemorial, in the caves of Trachonitis (the lava plateau now called el-Lega), where they are chased from Antioch by the dux Irenaios, with whom the emperor had meanwhile replaced Theodoros, with whom he was equally dissatisfied. And 20,000 Samaritan girls and boys are sold to Persia, to India as slaves.⁸⁵

The Samaritans, largely exterminated, virtually disappear from history since then.

The cause of the uprising? Obviously, the oppression by Christian Byzantium, which also persecuted the Manichaeans, Montanists, Jews, at least at times the Monophysites and others, but especially the extremely small minority of the Samaritans. Avi-Yonah is probably right when he calls their behavior in the 6th century a "result of their despair"; "the masses of this people suddenly understood that in view of the spread of Christianity in Palestine and abroad there was no longer any hope of maintaining their former position."

"86

Basically, as usual, the great uproar and even greater carnage was not about religion, one or the other, but about more tangible matters. For it was not by chance that the main part of the insurgents was recruited from the lowest stratum of the Samaritans, from the country people, artisans, colonists, slaves, who had hardly anything to lose, except their lives of course; who also elected their leader Julian from their ranks. They were the active element, while the upper classes reacted differently. Significantly, the top and numerically smallest class, which may well have been competing with the Christian Great Agrarians and had much to lose, immediately converted to Christianity, at least outwardly, so that the insurgents were not fully supported even by their own co-religionists.

378 Justinian I. For the poorest, most exploited, however, the primary concern was neither religion nor revolution, radical change, but only change within the framework of what existed; which, of course, was unacceptable to the Christian slaveholding class, which did everything it could to secure the status quo economically and ideologically.⁸⁷

By contrast, a very different and incomparably greater crime, Justinian's conquest of the West, was certainly as much about religion as politics, if, in terms of world politics, that can ever be separated. It is true that politics has long since ceased to have anything to do with religion, but religion always has to do with politics. Under Justinian, at any rate, the two were inseparable, and it was obviously his goal from the beginning to (re)establish the political and religious unity of the Roman Empire. He therefore undertook two great wars, wars of aggression, against two Germanic peoples, against two Christian peoples, who were admittedly "heretics", which is why they also remained "stuck in all uncultured and brutish savagery" (Catholic Schrödl). Thus it becomes "the favorite wish of his heart and his people to break the power of Arianism" (Catholic Höfler). This "favorite wish" led to the total annihilation of the Vandals, the Ostrogoths, to their complete disappearance from the world.⁸⁸

The Vandals or "Against those whom God is angry ..."

The Vandals, an East Germanic tribe already mentioned by Tacitus and the older Pliny, probably originally inhabited northern Jutland (today Vendsyssel) and Oslo Bay (today Hal-lingsdal). In the first two Christian centuries they lived, divided into Hasdingen, who were not extinct until Africa, and Silingen, who were extinct before that, as neighbors of Goths and Burgundians between Bug and Elbe, in central Poland, northeastern Germany and Silesia (lat. Silesia, slav. Sleza), named after

The Vandals 399 the Vandal tribe of the Silingen. They were already a horse-riding people at that time and later took their horses with them even on raids across the sea. Around the middle of the 3rd century they were situated at the middle Main, the tribe of the Hasdingen at the upper Tisza. For several generations they lived in what is now the Hungarian Plain. In 406 the Hasdingen-Vandals, perhaps fleeing the onrushing Huns from Pannonia, pushed up the Danube under King Godigisel to what is now Regensburg. Then they went down the Main, where about 20,000 Vandals and King Godigisel fell in heavy fighting with the Franks, the allies of the Romans. Only the intervention of the Alans and their king Respendial saved them from destruction. On New Year's Eve 406 they, "already Christians, Arians" (Tüchle), together with Alans, their old confederates, Suebi and the Silingen-Vandals, who joined them, crossed the frozen Rhine (denuded of troops because of the Visigoth danger in Upper Italy) near Mainz. They burned, what the Christian chroniclers describe in lurid colors, Mainz, where they also massacred many inhabitants who had fled to a church. They raided Worms, Trier, Reims, Amiens, Arras, Tournay, Narbonne, fortified towns, villages - "There lay some as food for the dogs," laments Bishop Orientius of Auch (Augusta) in Aquitaine at the time "the funeral procession of the sinking world." "In villages and houses, in the countryside, along the roads and in all districts, on all roads here and there, death, pain, destruction, defeat, fire and mourning reigned. All Gaul smoked like a huge funeral pyre." And the Spanish bishop Hydatius saw the four apocalyptic plagues coming: War,

famine, pestilence, and wild beasts.⁸⁹

All kinds of atrocities, which are attributed to the

Vandals during these enormous fire and murder campaigns, were committed later, especially by Saracens. Also, when the Vandals devastated Mainz and Gaul, when, according to later tradition, they are said to have murdered the bishops Desiderius of Langres and Antidius of Besançon, to emphasize this once again, they were already

400 Justinian I.

Christians, at least the probably already in Hungary "converted" Hasdingen. They used the Bible and liturgy of the Visigoth apostle Bishop Wulfila. It seems that in the battle of Toulouse in 422 they already used the word of Scripture as a battle cry. In Spain they were certainly Christians, haeretici, as Salvian testifies. And of course they also traced the origin of royal power back to God. Like all the Christian world, they also knew the kingship of God – an expression of the close connection between state and church.⁹⁰

The Vandals remained in Gaul for three years. Then they, with Alans and Suebi, under King Gunderich (407–428), Godigisel's son, conquered the poorly defended Pyrenees in the fall of 409 and invaded Spain (hence: Andalusia), where they spent two decades, devastating, plundering, killing, fighting Goths, Suebi, Romans, partly hard, also unleashing famines, epidemics. The Silingen were thereby wiped out in the years 416, 417, 418 by the Visigoths under Vallia.⁹¹

In Seville, King Gunderic drew the particular hatred of the Catholic clergy. He confiscated the church treasures of St. Vincent and thereupon died an abrupt death in 428 – apparently from the wrath of God. Now his half-brother Geiserich (428–477) took over the reign, an illegitimate son of King Godigisel (whom he saw die before his eyes in the battle against the Franks; according to Prokop he is said to have been crucified).

Geiserich, the son of a slave girl, as gifted and bold as he was unscrupulous, devious, richly capable of Roman diplomacy, was one of the "great" Germanic politicians of his time. In May 429 – a deed almost without equal – he brought about 80,000 Vandals, including women, children, old men and slaves, across the Strait of Gibraltar to Morocco, where he may already have established bases, but before that he had completely defeated the onrushing Suebi and an imperial army, thus keeping his return open just in case. However, with only about 16,000 warriors and atrocities never before committed by Germanic tribes, he conquered North Africa by storm – a land that had never been given to himself, but to the Vandals.⁴⁰¹

Carthaginians, Romans, the Vandals, Byzantines, Arabs, Turks, French. A country that, although weakened by Moorish rebellions, by religious, social-revolutionary, political conflicts, was still estimated to be populated by seven to eight million people. But in almost a year, Geiserich, against the resistance of the imperial troops, the nobility, the Catholic clergy, occupied more than 1000 kilometers of the coast. At the same time, at least according to the bishop Victor of Vita from the late Vandalic period, he rounded up the neighboring people here and there and let them run against the cities in order to advance behind the living cover or to pollute the fortress surroundings with the corpses of these people – which is said to have been done by Djin-gis-Khan as well. In the spring of 430 he defeated the imperial commander Boniface at Hippo Regius and besieged the city, while Augustine died in it (I 5x6 ff).²

On February 11, 435, the Vandals made peace at Hippo Regius and entered the service of the Romans as federates. After two years, however, there was strife, apparently for religious reasons. Presumably, Catholic clergy agitated against Arian worship and refused to grant churches to the "heretics." King Geiseric exiled some bishops, including Possidius of Calama, Augustine's biographer (I 530)."

At about the same time, the raids of the invaders began at sea. And when, in a sudden raid, Carthage fell to them without a stroke of the sword on October 19, 439, Geiserich confiscated all the property of the

opposing clergy and banished them, he equipped, by means of the ships lying in the harbor, a formidable fleet that dominated the Mediterranean for decades. Year after year, at the beginning of spring, he undertook his booty trips to Sicily, Italy, Spain, and later also to Greece, and as a Christian king he obviously knew how to dress up even his piracy in religious terms. Once in Carthage, now his residence, under sails already hoisted, asked where the voyage was going, he is said to have replied: "Against those whom God is angry with." Prokop: "So he fell upon all for no reason, as it happened."

40z Justinian I.

As early as 440, the Vandals, at the instigation of their bishop Maximus, were ravaging Sicily with pillaging and Catholic pogroms. (According to later Catholic chroniclers, the Sicilian Arians also killed many Catholics). But the imperial fleet sent out was ordered back in 441 because of imminent danger from the Huns, and Emperor Valentinian III and Byzantium were comfortable making peace in 442. Geiseric had thus created the first sovereign and independent Germanic state on Roman soil. He possessed its richest and most fertile provinces: Mauretania, Tingitana, Zeugitana, Byzacena and Numidia proconsularis. Finally, he also owned Sardinia and Corsica, whose forests he had cut down by exiled forced laborers for his shipbuilding. And around 455 he also got the Balearic Islands, already 42.5% plundered by him. From Gibraltar to Constantinople he ruled the sea and did not even nominally recognize the Byzantine emperor. Admittedly, he had to send his son Huneric to Italy as a pledge of peace.*

But also Italy's coasts were robbed and devastated by the Christian pirates, the only sea power among all the Germanic tribes. Rome itself, when in June 455 the Wandalic ships appeared uncannily fast at the mouth of the Tiber, was eviscerated for fourteen days – from the old imperial palaces to the temples, from precious Greek statues to bronze roof tiles – most conscientiously and according to plan, much more thoroughly than in 410 by the Visigoths of Alaric, but without bloodbaths, conflagrations and devastations (p. 36 ff). Of course, thousands of Roman citizens were also dragged away, especially high-ranking and younger ones. And soon Italy was afflicted by famine due to the cut off grain supply, which then led to the fall of the new emperor Avitus."

In the fifties, the Vandals conquered the last remaining Roman territories in North Africa. During the campaign of Emperor Majorian, Geiseric captured the Western Roman fleet, about 300 ships, in a great coup d'état in 460. It was supposed to lead the approaching army from Cartagena across the Strait of Gibraltar to

The Arian Geiseric pursues the Catholics in 403

Africa. But just before the emperor, arriving in May, joined his fleet, she was gone. And even a joint war of western and eastern Rome in 468 simultaneously from Italy, Egypt and Constantinople, highly dangerous for Geiseric, from where the main corps under Emperor Leo's brother-in-law Basiliskos sailed directly to Carthage, failed after again a large part of the Byzantine armada fell victim to a clever attack by the king at what is now Cape Bon, near Carthage. Emperor Zeno, in return for insignificant concessions from Geiseric, recognized the full possession of the Wandal Empire (including the islands) in 476. In the same year, the Western Roman Empire officially ceased to exist; while the Eastern Roman Empire survived for another thousand years, until 1453.⁹⁶

The Arian Geiseric persecutes the Catholics

Among all Germanic states, the Wandal Empire was the only one that was religiously intolerant and a bitter opponent of Catholicism, even if the hostility was not primarily religiously based. It concerned at first, however, a point at which the sole saint is always most sensitive, her income, her extensive goods. Corresponding confiscations made the Catholic clergy the irreconcilable enemy of the king. And like no other Germanic prince of the time, he knew how to politically exploit the still young Wandalic Christianity by making his fight against Rome also a fight of Arianism against Catholicism, which

hunted down all those of other faiths. This secured Geiserich the support of Arians and Donatists, but also of many who were indifferent to Rome or opposed its rule. There were enough anti-Roman sentiments, enough defectors and collaborators in an empire that owed its rule to blatant inhumanity. And since Geiserich immediately deposed the Catholic landlords against their savage rebelliousness
404 Justinian I.

And since Geiserich, against their wild rebelliousness, immediately expelled the Catholic landlords into misery, allegedly leaving them only the choice between exile and enslavement, which did not happen in such a way in any other Germanic state, since he systematically destroyed the land registers of the Roman tax authorities, in short, tried to liquidate the whole existing system, numerous slaves and colonists also ran to him. "Displaced and plundered are the lords," laments Bishop Sidonius Apollinaris, son-in-law of Emperor Avitus, "the barbarian occupies Africa, his rage has cast out the nobility of the land." ⁷

Rich churches and monasteries in particular were plundered, destroyed, since they were widely regarded as "ideological strongholds of Roman rule" (Diesner). As in general the Catholic civilian population nowhere resisted, was either indifferent or even sympathized with the invaders, also converted to the Arian confession – despite Geiserich's brutal attack especially on clerics and monks, on nuns, who were desecrated, whereby religious fanaticism played no small role, the belief "to fulfill a divine mission as bearer of Arianism" (Schmidt). Of course, Geiserich also had the tax-free estates confiscated for his warriors,

the *sortes Vandalorum*, cultivated again by colonists."

The Wandal king was subject to both churches. But in order to gain the religious unity of his empire, he wanted to convey the sole rule to Arianism, he made its church the state church, and the Catholic one, which had numerous episcopal sees, he systematically damaged. It, the very embodiment of Roman tradition, therefore became the leader and fomentor of resistance against the foreign-born conquerors and "heretics," who in turn naturally considered themselves the true continuators of "apostolic tradition" and the Catholics "heretics." For Geiserich, Arian and loyal to the king were just as identical as Catholic and hostile to the king. The Catholic clergy, however, apparently used their foreign connections to collude with foreign powers. Also literary bishops like Asclepius, Victor of Carthage, Voconius of Casteilum and others polemicized against the Arians

The Arian Geiserich persecutes the Catholics in 405.

mus. Even and especially in sermons their hatred did not stop, which even required a "pulpit paragraph" of the king. In any case, it was these constant confessional disputes "which again and again shook the strength of the empire and in the end helped to destroy it" (Giesecke)."

Now began a phase of permanent tribulations and pogroms for the Catholics, whose main source is the admittedly very one-sided "*Historia persecutionis Africanae provinciae*" of Bishop Victor of Vita, published in 488/89. The cunning Geiserich, who considered himself the divinely appointed head of the Arian national church, used little more against the Catholics than the "heretic" decrees decreed by the Catholic emperors since Theodosius I (1449 ff). Nor did the Wandalic Catholic persecutions "differ in anything from the persecutions Justinian waged against non-Catholics" (Dannenbauer).¹⁰⁰

Occasionally, as after the occupation of Carthage, the king confiscated all the movable and immovable property of the opposing clergy. He also had many of their churches closed, turned over to the Wandal clergy, or used as barracks. When the Catholics broke open one of these churches to celebrate Easter, the Arians under their local priest Andwit took action against them. Bishop Victor Vitensis reports about it: "They take up arms and enter the place of worship with drawn swords; others climb the roof and shoot their arrows through the windows of the church. Just at the time when the people were listening to God's words and singing, a reader standing in the pulpit intoned the Hallelujah; at the same moment, hit

by an arrow in the throat, he fell down dead and the book fell from his hands. As it is certain that many others were killed by arrows and spears in the middle of the altar's pedestal. And those who were not killed by the sword at that time were almost all tortured and killed afterwards by order of the king, especially people of higher age. Elsewhere, in fact, as happened in Tunuzuda, in Gales, Vicus.

406 Justinian I.

Ammoniae, and other places where the holy sacraments were offered to the people of God, they entered the churches in a terrible rage, hurling the body and blood of Christ on the stone tiles and trampling it with defiled feet!"¹⁰¹

Along with some senators and high officials, the king also exiled Catholic clerics over the years, including Carthage's chief shepherd Quodvultdeus (at whose instigation Augustine once created his "heresy" catalog "De haeresibus" containing 88 heresies) and Augustine's biographer Possidius of Calama, sometimes on ships less than seaworthy, sometimes leaving the high chairs unoccupied if the exiles died. Also, bishop's chairs in the centers of Wandalic power sometimes remained vacant after the death of their holders. According to Victor Vitensis, under Geiserich the number of bishops of the Zeugitana and Proconsularis provinces decreased from 164 to 3! All the others had been killed or expelled.¹⁰²

The Carthaginian cathedra stood empty for fifteen years, from 439 to 454, and when it was taken by Bishop Deogratias in October of that year, an insightful, un fanatic man, relations with the Catholics were undisturbed. But when, after his death in 457, the latter apparently took advantage of Geiserich's foreign policy difficulties to conspire against him, a number of those suspected of high treason were banished and the Carthaginian see was again unoccupied. In general, the king apparently persecuted the Catholic clergy far more in the interest of state security than for religious reasons.¹⁰³

Martyrdoms, however, he sought to avoid, so as not to inflame the religious fervor of the enemy. However, it did happen, due to both sectarian obstinacy and political motives. The Arian Vandals probably regarded Catholic Romans as enemies of the state from the outset, a view that the Catholics themselves knew well. And the Vandal clergy, like the Catholic clergy, did not like to miss the opportunity to satisfy their feelings of revenge.¹⁰⁴

Because of the constant danger of treason, Geiserich demanded

The Arian Geiserich persecute the Catholics 407

from his Roman court officials to convert to Arianism. Reluctant ones met first confiscation of property, then banishment, torture and finally execution. Christians exiled to the Moors, who had missionized there and requested priests from the neighboring Catholic bishop, were dragged to death by wild horses by the king. The bishop of Vita, Panpinianus, is said to have been martyred with red-hot iron sheets, and the bishop Mansuetus of Urusita was burned alive. Geiserich also punished with death the resistance to the prohibition of Catholic worship or its transgression.¹⁰⁵

Whatever Catholic chroniclers rightly upset about Geiserich, a glory was left to him by at least one of their own: Church Father Salvian of Marseilles praised Geiserich's fight against "fornication." It is significant that the Christian, who was extremely bloodstained, was extremely prudish when it came to sexuality; as is well known, this was a common combination. He fought not only pederasty, but also brothels, indeed, forced all the prostitutes to marry. "The King of the Vandals, who in case of need does not shrink from any bloody deed, feels such disgust before the metropolitan plague of public sexual immorality, and considers this whole abomination so pernicious for his peoples that he undertakes to eradicate it with stump and stick, and has apparently eradicated it for the duration of his life. A case unique in its kind in the entire history of the Occident and a real glory in the otherwise questionable glory of the King of the Vandals." ¹⁰⁶

The history of the Vandal state was almost exclusively handed down by Catholic clerics – even the few

profane historical testimonies are most strongly influenced by them – and probably very one-sidedly distorted, especially obviously by the Augustine-friend Bishop Possidius and the Bishop Victor Viten-sis, who wrote his "History of the Persecution in the Province of Africa" between 484 and 489, probably in Constantinople. The Vandals, in whose "Vandalism" in North Africa under Geiserich no one believes today, are associated by them with

408 Justinian I.

Slander. They tear the babies from the mother's breast, smash them on the ground, they turn priests and rich people into beasts of burden and rush them to death. And this quite obviously because it was their "main crime" "that they had been Arians" (Gautier). "The intransigent Arianism of the Vandals seems to be at least as much to blame as their raids and forays for the fact that their bad reputation has persisted so persistently through the centuries" (Finley).¹⁰⁷

How much Catholic authors often negate and distort reality, how they invent almost at random, may be shown by an example.

After Geiserich had left Rome, Paulus Diaconus, a cleric of the 8th century from a noble Langobardi family, reports, the king had destroyed Nola, among other places, and dragged away heaps of prisoners there, too. In the process, the bishop of Nola, St. Paulinus (who here, together with his wife, naturally led "a strictly monastic life without a marriage union": Altaner/Stuiber), in addition to his already somewhat withered poetic laurels, immortal fame. He sacrificed his entire fortune for the ransom of prisoners. Not enough: he offered his own precious person in exchange for the son of a poor widow. A noble move, certainly, but unfortunately, as so often, a lie. Paulinus, bishop of Nola, had died, as is certain, almost a quarter of a century before the Wandalic capture of Rome, namely in 431. So Geiserich, with the best will in the world, could not have released Bishop Paulinus in 455 without ransom, as Paulus Diaconus claims, out of admiration. On the other hand, the other conqueror of Rome, Alaric, when he also devastated Campania in 410, imprisoned him for a while, since he could not have guessed, again for good reasons, of his merits under Geiserich.¹⁰⁸

But for all the exaggeration, all the falsification of history by Catholic tradition, Geiserich's sharp, sometimes bloody action against the Roman clergy is not subject to doubt. This clergy, of course, was not only a rabia

Huneric and the Arian Clergy 409

ter opponent of Arianism, it had also increasingly become an enemy of the state. Meanwhile, the Wandal Catholic pogroms in Africa—as so often the plight of others! – had a great advantage for the pope. The African clergy, whose relationship with Rome was often tense, sometimes almost hostile (heresy controversy, Pelagian controversy, Apiarius affair, case of the bishop of Fussala), recognized under the pressure of the Vandals the primacy of the Roman head of the church, since they now hoped for intercession and help from him. Even Augustine had remarkable reservations about this primacy (p. 79). During the persecution, however, "the African church leaned completely toward Rome" (Marshall).¹⁰⁹

Huneric and the Arian clergy

EXPROPRIATE, BANISH, AND MASSACRE.

Geiserich died at a ripe old age in early 477. His son and successor was Huneric (477–484), whose wife Eudokia, the daughter of Valentinian III abducted from Rome by Geiserich in 455, allegedly fled to Jerusalem in 477 out of distaste for her husband's Arian faith. Nevertheless, Huneric was at first tolerant of the Catholics. More than an intervention of the emperor, this might have been due to the necessity to secure his throne. At first, the king only passionately persecuted and burned the Manicheans, praised by the Catholics for it, and his own relatives, whose succession he feared. Several he sent into exile penniless, such as his brother Theoderic and his brother Gento's son, Godagis, whose natural death saved

them from assassination. The highly educated wife of his brother Theoderich he had beheaded out of suspicion, her son likewise eliminated. (Geiserich had also once had the widow of Gunderich, his predecessor and half-brother, killed). The patriarch Lucius, formerly court preacher of Theoderic, now head of the

410 Justinian I.

Wandal church, was publicly burned in a Carthaginian square.¹¹⁰

Huneric allowed the Catholics to worship again. Yes, in 481 he had their bishop's chair in Carthage filled (by Eugenius). In return, of course, he demanded freedom for Arianism in the Eastern Empire, to which the Catholic prelates, significantly, preferred to forego concessions. And when Huneric realized that there was no threat of Byzantium reconquering North Africa, he changed course in religious policy, incited not least by the Wandal clergy.¹¹¹

Driven by greed, bloodlust, and religious mania, he began the systematic suppression of the Catholics, a heated persecution of their priests in particular: confiscation of all property (the fines from these pogroms were a more fruitful source of income than those from the state factories!), exile in the desert, dungeons, flogging, gruesome torture, even burning alive. Those who refused to become Arian, Prokop claims, "were burned or otherwise put to death." According to St. Isidore, Archbishop of Seville (d. 636), one of the "great teachers" of the Middle Ages and of the "greatest influence on cultural development" (Altaner/Stuiber), the wicked Huneric also had "the tongue of the confessors cut off, who thereafter, in spite of the cut tongue, could speak quite well to the end of their lives". The patriarch Kyrila apparently incited the king in particular. He is said to have persuaded him incessantly – and hardly unjustly – that without the eradication of Catholicism he could not enjoy a quiet and long reign. Huneric also fired the Catholic court officials and excluded all non-Aryans from the civil service. In addition to religious insanity, political motives again played a role: Incitement of the Catholic population against the king's orders, conspiratorial contacts of the opposing clergy to "overseas" countries. Huneric therefore also persecuted Arian clergy, burned them or threw them to wild animals. 4966 Catholics, however, he sent to the Moors in the desert in 483, the

Hüneric and the Arian clergy 411

worst place of exile of his time, where they allegedly perished miserably.¹¹²

The campaign reached its climax in Huneric's last year of rule.

On February 1, 484, he summoned all the Catholic bishops of his empire, 460 after all, to a religious discussion in the capital. He had the spokesmen maltreated beforehand, banished, Bishop Laetus of Nepte imprisoned, then burned, because, according to St. Isidore, "despite manifold punishments, he could not be brought to stain himself with the plague of Arian heresy". When the opposing prelates could not be intimidated, the Arians backtracked on the debate and blamed it on the Catholics.

Hüneric then had all their churches closed on February 7 and banned Catholicism altogether on February 24. All Catholic churches and their property were handed over to the Arians, all Catholic rituals and meetings were forbidden, all Catholics who did not convert (by June 1) were deprived of their civil rights, and court officials were stripped of their dignity and declared infamous. There were fines, confiscation of property, deportation, book burnings. Those responsible were also subject to confiscation and death for lax implementation of the regulations. Hüneric appointed whole groups of torturers, who were supposed to torture all unconverted Catholics in the crudest way, if necessary to kill them. About 30 different kinds of torture and torture instruments are known. Many Catholics, including 88 bishops, fell away from their faith.¹¹³

The execution of the laws was the responsibility of the Arian clergy, who supervised the persecution, carried it out with great brutality, and often went beyond the king's regulations in a way that was as arbitrary as it was cruel. Bishops and priests went armed through the country for the great work of

conversion, did not even consider forced baptisms of the gagged to be contrary to the sacraments, and even entered houses at night with swords to proselytize, giving Catholics the choice between rebaptism, 4i2 Justinian I.

Wealth, honors and punishments ranging from confiscation of property to deportation and death. Catholic women were even said to have been crucified naked. However, as before, martyrdoms were avoided as much as possible in wise calculation.¹¹⁴

As in other Christian states, capital punishment was nevertheless common among the Arian Vandals, especially beheading, aggravated by previous torture, burning, drowning, being dragged to death by horses, and being thrown in front of wild animals. Popular tortures were flogging, cutting off noses, ears, hands, feet, tearing out tongues and eyes. Torture was often used, especially in the persecutions of Catholics, and these punishments were largely derived from Roman law.¹¹⁵

A grandiose cynicism, already hinted at, a certain consequence, if you will: that during the briefest but most severe persecution in the Wandalene Empire, the harshest Byzantine-Roman "heretic" edicts from the Do-natist period were also applied against the Catholics themselves. For they had long anticipated all this.¹¹⁶

The extent of their martyrdoms, however, they exaggerated enormously, as they always do when they are persecuted instead of being persecuted. Bishop Victor Vitensis invokes again and again an innumerable multitude, but names only twelve in all; and they did not even all end with the blood testimony, which, by the way, proves the least among all "testimonies", but breeds the greatest fanaticism among all. Prokop's report already shows the legendary coloration when he claims of Hunerich, "many he also had the tongue cut off at the root. Of these, some were still living in Constantinople in my time, but they could speak with a strong voice because this torture had not harmed them. Two of them, however, lost their speech there afterwards, after they had consorted with whores".¹¹⁷

Hunerich succumbed early to illness in December 484. The Catholics rejoiced, as they always do, when one of their adversaries dies. And, as always, they naturally put this end-

Hunerich and the Arian clergy 413

as a punishment from God. According to Victor of Vita, Huneric is said to have been eaten by worms; according to Victor of Tonnena, he is said to have died, like Arius (I 374), by his intestines coming out. And Gregory of Tours, who abhorred everything that was not Frankish among Teutons, now exulted, "But Hunerich, as a reward for such infamies, was himself seized by the evil spirit, and he, who had long drunk the blood of the saints, tore himself to pieces with his own teeth....",¹¹⁸

Christian historiography!

Hunerich's radicalism, while yielding considerable success, exacerbated the Wandal-Roman antagonism. And while Gunthamund (484-496) gradually stopped the pogroms, partially repealed the banishment decrees, and only groups of the Arian clergy persecuted on their own, Gunthamund's clever brother King Thrasamund (496-523), who was even strongly involved in the religious struggle himself in a journalistic way, again thoughtfully favored Arianism. Since the Catholics, against royal orders, gave new bishops to their parishes, Thrasamund decreed new banishments. Yes, under him, "equally outstanding in beauty as in character and intellect", the Vandals are said to have occasionally placed their horses and draught animals in the temples of the Catholics - "and they also committed other outrages of every kind, maltreated and beat the priests and used them for the lowest slave services" (Prokop). In general, however, the brother-in-law of the Gothic king Theoderic worked less with violence than with calculated gentleness, gave converts honors, offices, rich gifts, and even pardoned criminals if they converted. And the exiles in Sardinia, first 60, then 120, then more, were doing tolerably well. They had contacts with the outside world and received clothes and money annually through Pope Symmachus.¹¹⁹

But then nephew and successor Hilderich (523–530) initiated a contrary policy and with it the downfall of his people.

Hilderich, the grandson of Valentinian III and son of Eudokia, the emperor's toch carried off from Rome in 455 by the Vandals

414 Justinian I.

ter, had been mostly in Byzantium, "close friends with Justinian" (Prokop), and, unlike his father Hunerich, strongly pro-emperor and pro-Rome. To be sure, the dying Thra-samund had made him swear not to tolerate any reorganization of Catholicism. But Hilderich – "in order not to violate the sanctity of the oath" (St. Isidore of Seville) – even before his accession to power, probably in agreement with Emperor Justin, recalled the banished Catholic bishops, ordered the vacant chairs to be filled again and

the return of expropriated churches. Yes, the feeble eldest son of Huneric, then admittedly an old man, surrounded himself with Romanesque nobility and did everything to win the favor of Eastern Rome and the Catholics.¹²⁰

Hilderich even sacrificed the pact with Theoderic to this strongly pro-Catholic and pro-Byzantine policy. He had his sister Amalafrida, Thrasa-mund's widow, who vigorously advocated the preservation of the alliance with the Goths, accused of conspiracy and killed together with her escort of 1000 Gothic doryphors (bodyguards) and 5000 belligerent servants. The enmity between the two Germanic states that existed since then probably contributed decisively to the downfall of both. Theoderich, whom the news of the fate of the sister reached in the last months of his reign, planned a revenge move against Hilderich. And since he now had to reckon with the combined naval power of the Byzantines and the Vandals, he built his own fleet of a thousand dromons, fast ships, in the shortest possible time. On June 13, 526, they were to assemble at Ravenna, but on August 30 he died.¹²¹

The next year, when Hilderich's cousin and army commander Oamer suffered a severe defeat at the hands of the Moors, the old ruler, who had not fought himself, flew to prison, as did Oamer, who eventually died in it, blinded, and Gelimer, a great-grandson of Geiseric and next in line to the throne, became king on June 15, 530. This coup d'état, however, gave Emperor Justinian, who acted as Hilderich's protector, the pretext for

The Catholic clergy wanted "a kind of crusade" ⁴¹⁵

to war. And in his campaign of destruction, in the downfall of Wandal Arianism and Wandal people, Catholicism has an outstanding share?²²

The Catholic clergy wants "a kind of crusade" against the Vandals

One cannot expect the harassed Catholics to be sympathetic to the state of their persecutors, not even given their obligation to be subservient to the authorities, for Gelimer was, after all, a usurper. Also, the Catholic Church in particular hardly cared for authorities, they were not sympathetic to it and, moreover, they were weak. Thus, Catholics under Thrasamund were not inconsiderably inclined even to the Moorish prince Kabaon, perhaps conspiring with him. At least he based his fight against Thrasamund on the support of his Catholic subjects, courted the Catholic clergy, restored the Catholic churches desecrated by Thrasamund – and won the campaign: "most" of the Vandals were killed at that time "by the pursuing enemies, some were made prisoners, few finally returned home from this campaign" (Prokop).¹²³

There is no question that Catholic Rome wanted to see Wandal Arianism destroyed. Even in the year of the Byzantine overthrow in 519, Pope Hormisdas asked the new emperor what he intended to do in favor of Catholicism in the Wandal Empire. But even the good Catholic Justin evaded.^{12*}

Neither the ministers were enthusiastic about the clerical crusade desires, nor the military, nor even the financial officials! The memory of Geiseric, the terror of the seas, was still too vivid, also that of the fate

of Basiliskos (p. 298). Moreover, the troops had only just returned from the Persian campaign; admittedly just finished by the emperor, in order to now be able to fight the Vandals with all their strength. But the throne council was decidedly against money was scarce because of the Persian conflict, troop morale was poor, and the Vandal navy was still feared. All this, weighty enough, seemed to have already changed Justinian's mind, although he would undoubtedly have been only too happy to reconquer North Africa, still important economically and in terms of power politics, especially since he himself had also been very committed religiously.¹²⁵ But then the Catholic clergy got into the act, the living, the dead, God himself. For this, claimed a bishop from the Orient, who was suspected to have acted as an agent of his African brothers, had commanded him to reproach the emperor for his dithering and to announce the highest help in liberating the Catholics from the Wandalen yoke. "God himself would assist him, make him the Lord of Africa" (Prokop). And a dead prelate, Laetus of Nepte (p. 411), by his martyrdom under Hünnerich "suddenly entered heaven victorious" (St. Isidore), reappeared, appeared to Justinian in a dream, and likewise drove him to war. Moreover, priests were widely agitating from the pulpits, eloquently spreading the real or alleged abominations of the "heretics."¹²⁶

In short, there is little doubt that one of Justinian's main reasons for the war was "the liberation of the African Catholics" (Kaegi), that the emperor waged the war "in the main for confessional reasons" (Kawerau), as "a kind of crusade" (Diehl), as a "holy war against the Arians" (Woodward), "that the religious moment tipped the scales with Justinian . . . the final impetus to the war ... which ended with the destruction of the Wandalic people" (Schmidt). "The Catholic clergy bears a good part of the responsibility for the outbreak of the internecine wars of the age The influence of the church extended to the last village" (Rubin).¹²⁷

Is this bellicosity of the (Catholic) clergy so surprising or even unbelievable? Are there not plausible motives for it? Is there not, above all, a reason that we will encounter again and again through the centuries, a reason that Pope Agapet (535–536) once gives to Emperor Justinian when he writes: "Infinite thanks do I give to our God that.

". . . WE BRING YOU PEACE AND FREEDOM!" 417 such zeal for the increase of the Catholic people glows in you: for thus, wherever your empire extends its borders, the eternal kingdom also immediately begins to grow." In those days, the Latin liturgy prayed for the destruction of the enemies of the empire and the faith in one breath: "Hostes Romani nominis et inimicos catholicae religionis expugna".¹²⁸

And Justinian just then bowed deeply to Rome: "Always it has been our endeavor to preserve unity with your Apostolic See and the state of the churches. For in all things we are concerned that the honor and authority of your See may grow". Pope John II (532 to 535) could only be delighted that the sovereign, in his zeal for the faith and "instructed by ecclesiastical law, showed due reverence to the Roman See, submitted everything to it, and brought everything back to unity with it."¹²⁹

". . . WE BRING YOU PEACE AND FREEDOM!"

In June 533, the emperor launched a fleet of 500 transport ships and 92 warships (dromons) with about 15000 to 20000 men, including Heruls and Huns. The Patriarch of Constantinople, Epiphanius, while still in port, had invoked the blessing of heaven on the work so pleasing to God, had still blessed the troops and had performed the "usual prayers" (Prokop) before the departure. The commander-in-chief was Beisaris, a good Catholic, a good soldier – "a chivalrous Christian, to whom the teachings of his Savior live in his blood, not only in his head" (Thieß). How true, God knows, if (in the Nika uprising) 30 000 or 50 000 people, Christians, Catholics can be sabered like cardboard figures – just so that one man (beast would be missed) keeps the crown! Very popular with his butchers, the greatest commander of the century and, like the emperor, Bau-ernsprößling. As usual: the wife Antonina at his side,

418 Justinian I.

a courageous, but somewhat disreputable person, a friend of the empress, who betrayed the general, who was loyal to her, even to the point of bondage, with his adopted son Theodosius, with the friendly approval of the pious Theodora. On board also Beiisar's chief of staff, eunuch Salomon, strict, skilled at his craft and unpopular; and historian Prokop, who between 527 and 540 followed Beiisar as secretary and confidant on his Persian, African and Italian campaigns, a classic of historiography. Not only once did he see the finger of God in the strategic measures of the chief, indeed, he considered them to have been directly prompted by him.¹³⁰

The Byzantines were supported, at least indirectly, by the Goths – their next victim. The murder of Theoderic's sister Amalafrika and her 6000 protectors (p. 414) was unforgettable. And Amalaswintha, daughter and successor of Theoderic, as the first woman regent of a Germanic empire, apparently allowed Beiisar to approach Sicily, to make it the starting point of the campaign, indeed, seems to have reinforced his troops.¹³¹

The war, already passed off as a religious war against the Wandal "heresy" at the start in Constantinople, was not least waged as such. In Sardinia and Tripoli, there were immediate uprisings, as the Catholics now wanted to shake off the Arian yoke. In Salecta, the first city that Beiisar took two days after his landing (on August 30 or 31, 533), it was above all the bishop who allowed him to open the gates. With the Catholic clergy the general also first sought contact, although he had to tactic cleverly, in view of the approximately 1000 Arians of his own army, mostly foederati. The churches were carefully spared. And in an appeal of Justinian spread everywhere, they even claimed not to fight the Vandals, but merely the "tyrant" Gelimer, of course "in the name of God". "We do not wage war against you, but only against Gelimer, your cruel tyrant, from whom we want to free you! For we bring you peace and freedom!"¹³²

Justinian was more fortunate than probably anyone, except himself and the himself and the bishops, dared to hope. It is true that 500 soldiers died of spoiled bread already during the journey (due to the thriftiness of the prefect John), without the prefect being punished for it by the emperor – after all, he ruled thanks to his exploits. And while the massive expedition had failed miserably in 468, Beiisar's small army won Africa in a lightning campaign, one of the greatest military "achievements"

in a long time. One landed 200 kilometers south of Carthage, at Kaput Vada, in early September 533. The dreaded Vandal fleet, under King Gelimer's brother Tzazon, was on its way with the best troops to put down the rebellion in Sardinia, where the insurrectionist Godas, who submitted to the emperor, was defeated and executed. Other Vandal field bands operated in the south against the Moors. Nevertheless, Gelimer, with an army still quite superior in numbers but much less experienced in battle, would have surrounded and destroyed the enemy by a hair's breadth at Dekimon, about 14 kilometers from Carthage, on September 13, had it not been for his indecisive hesitation, his lamentation at the sight of his dead brother.¹³³

The Vandals were certain of their victory and had already prepared a feast for Gelimer in the Carthaginian royal castle. Their battle plan: the king's brother Ammatas was to take the Byzantines from the front at Dekimon, a contingent of 2,000 men under Gibamund was to seize them on the left flank, and the king with the main force was to seize them in the rear. Beiisar was clueless and only the bad luck of the Vandals saved him from ruin. Ammatas, in fact, arrived six hours too early, already attacked the Byzantine vanguard with part of his force, was slain, and the rest of his fleeing men were cut down many times. Almost simultaneously, Beiisar's 600 Huns blew Gibamund's 2000 men apart by a surprise advance and stabbed them all. Gelimer himself, however, in his haste and eagerness to fight, had overtaken Beiisar's bulk unseen and now, contrary to his plan, crashed into Gibamund with the head of

the main Byzantine con-
42.0 Justinian 1.

tingent. It fled in the face of the onrushing Wandal superiority to Beiisar, who caught it unflinchingly and immediately moved against Gelimer.¹³⁴

Prokop, who had spent the day in Beiisar's immediate vicinity, writes about the decisive battle, which basically resulted in the downfall of the Ostrogoths: "Here I am faced with a riddle. It is completely incomprehensible to me how Gelimer came to freely surrender to the enemy the victory he already held in his hands ... For if Gelimer had immediately taken up the pursuit of the defeated enemy, then in my opinion Beiisar himself would not have held out either, but our cause would have been hopelessly lost. So formidable appeared the superiority of the Vandals and the fear which they instilled in the Romans. But if he had rushed to Carthage immediately, he could have effortlessly cut down John and his warriors.... But neither of them he did. On foot he descended from the heights, and when he came to the plain and saw the body of his brother, he burst into a loud wail and made arrangements for his burial, thus leaving the decisive moment unused, so that he was gone forever.

Beiisar, however, met his fleeing soldiers, thundered a <Halt!> at them, brought them all back into line, let down a thunderstorm on them, and when he had heard of the death of Ammatas and the pursuit (of the Vandals) by John and had learned what he wanted about the location and the enemies, he advanced in a storm on Gelimer and the Vandals. The barbarians, however, who were already in disorder and not prepared for any attack, did not expect the approaching enemy at all, but tore out what they could, losing many people in the process. The killing continued into the night. "¹³³

Beiisar entered Carthage on September 15. "We ate Gelimer's dishes, drank Gelimer's wine, and had Gelimer's servants wait on us-the whole meal had been prepared for that one the day before. A rather striking example of how the

"... we bring you peace and freedom!" 4ZI fate plays along with man, and how their will is not able to do anything against it!"¹³⁶

Four days' journey from Carthage, the king gathered his defeated troops, received a not inconsiderable influx of Moors and reinforcements from Tzazon, who was hurrying back from Sardinia, but no help in arms from the Visigoths, who had learned of the Vandal defeat from a merchant before the arrival of Gelimer's envoys. At Tri-camarum, a place about 30 kilometers west of Carthage, which can no longer be located, a last desperate battle was fought in December 533. During the third onslaught of the Byzantines, Gelimer's brother Tzazon fell, the Vandals fled after a lion-like fight, and all the fleeing men were cut down until nightfall. Finally, "except for those begging for protection in the sanctuaries, there are no more Vandals to capture". Everything, writes Prokop, "was thus put in the most beautiful order...". Gelimer himself, with a few comrades, rescues himself to friendly Moors in inaccessible mountainous country on the extreme border of Numidia, where he finally surrenders, surrounded, months later. At Tricamarum, however, the Catholic victors become the masters not only of the immense treasures stolen from all over the Mediterranean, but also of the "blooming and gloriously beautiful bodies" of Wandal women and girls, and they race with greed.¹³⁷

"For the Roman soldiers," reports the Byzantine chronicler and eyewitness, "who were destitute people and now suddenly found themselves in possession of immense treasures and marvelously beautiful women, no longer remained powerful of their senses and seemed insatiable in the silence of their lusts: full of unimagined happiness, they staggered along as if drunk, as if each thought only of bringing his treasures to safety on the next route to Carthage. All military order was dissolved; singly or in pairs, as the hope of booty drove them, they searched all around in ravines and caves and other dangerous places. Fear of the enemy and timidity of Beiisar no longer existed; the lust for booty eel-
422 Justinian I. lein ruled them, as whose slaves they no longer cared for anything. "¹³⁸

Papal congratulations for the "spread of God's wealth" or "They were all beggars."

After the victory, the Wandal men were mostly killed, the women, the children enslaved, the king taken to Constantinople and in the summer of 534 performed in the triumphal procession in the Hippodrome, where he had to throw himself in the dust before the imperial throne, stripped of his purple. As a vassal he ended his days on a large estate in Galatia. He refused to convert to Catholicism, for which he could expect high honors. His fellow prisoners were sent to the Roman army and mostly to the Persian border, five regiments of horsemen, the so-called Vandali Justiniani. One regiment, however, fled back to Africa after overpowering the ship's crew on transport near the island of Lesbos. Large contingents of troops were thrown into Africa, ports and cities were fortified and strong forts were built everywhere in the hinterland.^{13'}

The Catholic Church, which celebrated Justinian as a liberator from the "hundred years of captivity", immediately got back all its properties, also its rank before all other religions and became overnight from a persecuted again to a persecutor. For, of course, the Catholic clergy now collaborated with the new masters just as the Arian clergy had collaborated with the old ones. Once again, there was a sharp crackdown on pagans, Donatists, Jews, who were now basically robbed of their synagogues. Above all, the end of the Vandal state was also the end of the Vandal faith. Justinian himself, who was about to wage war against the Ostrogoths, was inclined to a moderate religious policy. But the African episcopate and Pope Agapet changed his mind. By decree of August 1, 535

Papal Congratulations 423

he took away the churches from the Arians, forbade their services, the appointment of bishops, clergymen and excluded them from all offices. He also intervened against the other non-Catholics.¹⁴⁰ Even the Catholic "Handbook of Church History" admits: "Exceedingly harsh were the measures taken by the decree with regard to the Arians, Donatists, Jews and pagans; they had to close their places of worship, refrain from every cultic act, every meeting was forbidden, it was enough if they could live. The pope congratulated the emperor on such zeal for the spread of the Kingdom of God".¹⁴¹

After all the butchery, Arianism in Africa was not yet completely defeated, especially since it received an influx of Arian Goths among Beiisar's troops. But they, too, having found themselves cheated in the land allotment and severely oppressed religiously with the still living Wandalian Arians, were finally, after long, hard fighting, defeated and the Wandalian soldiers' wives, who in the meantime had been married to them, were chased into exile. "Of the Vandals who remained in their native land," writes Prokop, "there is no trace left in my time. They, being few in number, have either been crushed by neighboring barbarians, or have voluntarily mingled with them, and so even their name has disappeared." "Thus the Wandal Empire," Archbishop Isidore of Seville triumphs, "was exterminated with stump and handle in the year 534, after it had existed from Guntherich to Gelimer's fall 113 years."¹⁴²

Militarily and politically, however, anything but peace returned to Africa. The Byzantine administration was largely corrupt, the tax exploitation such that people mourned the Wandal generosity. The colonists were treated far worse than under the "barbarians", even their own Arian units were disadvantaged, the others were occasionally paid late, in short, the discontent of wide circles increased. And mutinies and revolts within were joined by attacks from without.¹⁴³

4M Justinian I.

As early as 534, the Byzantine formations under their not incompetent but brutal magister militum Salomon, Beli-sar's successor, were engaged in battle against several nomadic tribes. Entire imperial cavalry units perished in the process. In 535, Salomon succeeded in slaughtering more than 50,000 of the Berbers who had advanced as far as

central Tunisia. But the following years brought new nomadic attacks as well as repeated serious mutinies of soldiers. "The unhappy country," Prokop's "Wandalenkrieg" ends, "was not to achieve lasting peace. Solomon falls in battle against the Moors; his nephew Sergius, appointed his successor, makes himself universally hated and cannot hold his own. Justinian sends his own nephew Areobindus to bring order. This prince, however, is not a warrior at all; he falls victim to a military conspiracy headed by a certain Gontharis, who rises up to become a tyrant. Now a wild confusion begins: any officer believes he can become ruler of Africa; assassination, devastation and plundering are the order of the day. Finally Gontharis, around whom the last Vandals had rallied, falls with them at the hands of the Armenian Arta-banes, who receives from Justinian the *magisterium militare* over all Africa. His successor John crushes the last sparks of the rebellion.... Few were left of the population of Africa; after so much tribulation, they finally had peace. But at what a price! They were all beggars."1**

From the "great hunt for the Goths"

AND MANY THINGS IN THE MARGIN

The Arian Vandal Empire had long and at times vilely persecuted the Catholics, no doubt one of the reasons for its destruction. But the Arian Ostrogoths did not know any religious lunacy. Theoderic was certainly bloody and

From the "great drive hunt on the Goths" 425 roguishly enough arrived at Ravenna, but then foreign policy always sought peace. With complete independence, he recognized the supremacy of Eastern Rome. And domestically he seriously strove for the reconciliation of Romans and Germanic tribes. Especially towards the Catholics, whom in 500, during his only visit to Rome, the Pope received at the head of the clergy, he showed a remarkable tolerance. Even if the Manicheans were repeatedly banished from Rome under the king, and sacrificing pagans were even threatened with death, the popes could always communicate freely with bishops outside Italy. They, their church, were more independent than they had been for many generations, indeed, "than under any of the orthodox emperors" (Pfeilschifter). Yet, if anything, they exterminated the Ostrogoths even more cruelly. Only sixty years, from 493 to 553, their empire existed, more than half of that time under Theoderic.¹⁴⁵

As long as he stood at the height of his power, Eastern and Western Rome, Emperor Anastasios, the Pope, the Senate, maintained a good understanding with him. He continually supported Rome, including an annual appropriation of 200 pounds of gold for the upkeep of its walls; Pope Symmachus even received money from the king's private treasury. But in the last years of the king's life, when Justin and the pope came to an agreement, when the persecution of the Arians began in the Eastern Empire, the anti-Gothic current grew among the Catholics of Italy. Yes, in the ecclesiastical tradition of the Middle Ages Theoderic lives on merely as a "heretic", tyrant and devil, he disappears already with Pope Gregory I and Gregory of Tours in the pit of hell.¹⁴⁶

The king, who had died without leaving any sons, had appointed his grandson Athalarich as his successor. For the roughly eight-year-old, his mother, Theoderic's daughter Amalaswintha (526-534), took over the regency, having three Gothic greats she suspected of opposition murdered. However, when she married the last male Amalian, her cousin and mortal enemy Theodahad (534-536), after the death of the young Athalaric (October 534), he, despite all oaths to the contrary, banished the wife, cousin, and co-ruler as early as the

42.6 Justinian I.

spring of 535 to a small island in Lake Bolsen and had her strangled there.¹⁴⁷

To all appearances, Theodora, out of feminine jealousy and deviousness, had a hand in the bloody game- and Justinian took the murder as a pretext to rise up as an avenger, as he had against Gelimer, now also against Theodahad. Not for a moment did he hesitate "to let the sword, still dripping with the blood of the Vandals, be drawn by the same commander against the Goths" (Iordanes) - or in the words of Grisar

SJ: it now came to "such heroic deeds – as are a rarity in the history of war".¹⁴⁸

With 7000 men, 200 mounted Huns, 300 Moors, to which later, of course, considerable reinforcements joined, Beli-sar conquered Italy at first almost in a blitzkrieg, although intrigues at the imperial court hindered him no less than Justinian's jealousy itself. At the end of 435, Sicily, hardly occupied by the Goths, fell to him almost without a fight. He effortlessly took Catania, where he landed, Syracuse, and finally Palermo. The invasion of lower Italy was also successful. Without serious resistance he advanced to the north, but "the high clergy was certainly won over to the Byzantine interest": Davidsohn. (In Tuscia, they then delivered the cities to the imperials without waiting for a summons first). Naples, however, is fiercely defended, especially by Jews who fear Catholic fanaticism. Only after 600 of the besiegers crawl through an empty water pipe into the city, it is taken by surprise. Hideous slaughter ensues, even in the churches. As Prokop testifies, the Byzantines, fencing under the cross, "mercilessly slaughtered everyone who got in their way, regardless of age. They entered the houses and dragged children and women as slaves; everything was plundered". The Huns themselves killed many of those who took refuge in the churches. (After the reconquest of Naples by Totila, the latter spared not only the population, but even the Byzantine troops.)¹⁴⁹

Holy Father was in the days of the advance on Rome.

Of the "great drive against the Goths" ^{42.7} Silverius (536–537), the son of Pope Hormisdas. On 2,0 June 536, Gothic king Theodahad made him a bishop by coercion and considerable bribery. Silverius, in fact, conspired with the "heretical" Goths. Like part of his clergy, he feared them less than the Caesaropapism of the Catholic emperor. They were also closer to him – spatially – and held power here. And when in November, in place of the dubious Theodahad, who conspired with Justinian, the army commander Witigis stepped in (who ordered to kill Theodahad, repudiated his wife and to legalize the regency, but against her will, took the thirty years younger Theoderic's granddaughter Mataswintha as his wife), Pope Silverius, a "man of strong character and holy" (Catholic Daniel-Rops) also swore allegiance to the new Goth king – and soon sent messengers to Beiisar to summon him to Rome. Then, on the night of December 10, 536, St. Silverius, who owed his papacy to the Goths, regardless of his oath, had Beiisar, who had advanced from Naples, open the porta Asi-naria, close to the Lateran Basilica, in the south of the city. The small Gothic garrison fled at the same time through the porta Flaminia in the north, and the Romans jubilantly greeted the Byzantines as liberators, eradicators of the Arian "heresy," also in the hope of restoring the Roman Empire.¹⁵⁰

But when in the spring of 537 Witigis surrounded Rome with supposedly 150,000 men, but Beiisar was able to oppose him with only 5,000 men, St. Pope, who had a strong character, seems to have readjusted himself to a change of power and remembered that he was actually a pope of the Goths. At the very least, he came under suspicion of now wanting to betray encircled Rome to the Goths. "Since it was suspected," Prokop writes, "that Silverius, the chief priest of the city, was forging treason with the Goths, he [Beiisar] immediately sent him to Hellas and soon after appointed another bishop named Vigilius." ¹⁵¹

The scholastic Mark and the praetorian Julian had produced forged letters that Silverius sent to the Goths. And the deacon Vigilius, the next pope, fueled the suspicions of

^{4*8} Justinian I against his predecessor. Actually Vigilius, apocri-sary in Constantinople, had already wanted to become pope instead of Silverius, especially since Boniface II (530–532) had already once designated him as his successor, which Boniface, however, had to take back after the objection of a synod. Now, however, Vigilius had arrived in Rome too late from Byzantium and had already occupied what he was to get this time according to Theodora's plan.¹

For 700 gold pieces (septem centenaria), the empress had bought the deacon so that as pope he would favor the Monophysites. "Bishop's throne and money, these were his loves," says a colleague of his, the

Carthaginian deacon Liberatus, who uses good sources for his work of history. (To estimate the amount of the bribe: 200 gold pieces cost a large church building at that time). Now that Vigilius had promised Beislar a share, 200 of his gold pieces, as ordered, the general called on 11. March for the first time Pope Silverius to him in the imperial palace on the Pincio - "He entered the palace alone - and then he was seen no more", reports Liberatus dramatically and lets recognize that the fall of Silverius was based on the accusation of highly treacherous relations with the Goths, which is also confirmed by other sources, the continuator of Marcellinus Comes and Prokop, so that it "can not be shaken" (Hildebrand). "Say, Lord Pope Silverius," spoke Antonina on March 21, lying on a pillow of the Pinciopalace, the husband Beislar at his feet, "what have we done to you and the Romans that you want to deliver us into the hands of the Goths?" Beislar thereupon had Silverius, whom he had guaranteed safety, put in a monk's habit, declared him deposed, banished him to Patara in Lycia, and the very next day, March 22, Vigilius was elected pope and consecrated the following Sunday, March 29.

But when Justinian, thwarting his wife's game, sent Silverius back again - which the papal envoy in Constantinople, the deacon Pelagius, also bought by Theodora, tried in vain to prevent on Vigilius' behalf - his successor, Pope Vigilius, intercepted him on the way and conducted From the "great drive hunt for the Goths" 4x9 him by his beadies immediately on to a new exile, to the island of Ponza. There, just a few weeks later, on December 2, 537, he succumbed to the harassment of his jailers, the two defenso-res and the slaves of Vigilius, who starved his predecessor to death-"a victim of the confused course of time" (the Catholics Seppelt/Sch waiger).¹⁵³

The unfortunate sufferer, St. Silverius, who is said to have renounced his papacy shortly before his death in favor of his successor and murderer, was soon transfigured by legend. People went on pilgrimage to his tomb, where, of course, miracles occurred. His intercession was invoked, especially in times of need from which he himself could not be delivered - except by death. In Rome, where the entire clergy had once abandoned him and made Vigilius pope, albeit under Beislar's massive pressure, people now began to rehabilitate Silverius, to praise him as a martyr. Vigilius was all the more readily and readily criticized, even compiled a writ of complaint accusing him of being complicit in the fall of Silverius.¹⁵⁴ But Pope Vigilius, who was to have his difficulties with Justinian, first of all certified him in the first of his preserved letters "not only imperial but also priestly sense" and welcomed him enthusiastically as the one who "subdued so many peoples more with the strength of faith than with the strength of soldiers' bodies" - and this at a moment when he was waging a horrible war of extermination hardly with prayer books.¹⁵⁵

In the meantime, for a year, until March 538, Witigis raided Rome with his Goths, with walking towers, assault ladders, assault rams, always anew he set on, always anew Beislar's special troops, the mounted Huns, the Moors, made dangerous forays. The surroundings of the city, courtyards, villas, magnificent buildings, are completely devastated. In Rome, the most beautiful creations of the Greeks and Romans, irreplaceable masterpieces, are ruined in order to kill the storming Goths with the stones. In addition, heat, hunger and epidemics rage; the senators pay for disgusting sausages made from the flesh of dead mules.

430 Justinian I.

with gold. A relief army from Constantinople reinforces the besieged. But 2000 horsemen under colonel John, the "bloodhound" (so the chroniclers), rage in Picenum against Gothic women, children, whose husbands and fathers stand before Rome. After almost 70 defeated storms, Witigis departs with terrible losses at the hands of the tactically and technically superior Beislar, who occupies almost the entire country as far as the Po Valley.¹⁵⁶

In the winter of 538/39, when the Byzantines expelled all the Goths from Emilia and Witiges repaired the walls of Ravenna, a severe famine struck northern central Italy in particular. Thousands and

thousands succumb to it. Prokop, the eyewitness, reports an estimated 50,000 starved to death from Picenum alone; even more from the northern regions. "But what kind of appearance the people got and in which way they died, I want to tell, since I have seen it myself, in more detail. They all became lean and pale, for the flesh (of their bodies), for lack of nourishment, according to the old word, ate itself up, and the bile, which, as a result of their excess weight, now had power over the bodies, spread a yellowish pale color over them. And as the evil progressed, all moisture had gone out of the human bodies, and their skin, which had dried up completely, had become similar to leather, giving the appearance of being nailed to the bones. And their pale color turned to blackness, so that they resembled torches that had burned out excessively. Their faces had the expression of horror; their gaze was like that of madmen looking at something terrible ... Some of them, in the excess of hunger, even attacked each other. It is said that on a farmstead above Ariminum two women, who were the only ones left in the area, ate seventeen men. For the strangers coming along the way used to spend the night in the house where these two lived. The women then murdered them in their sleep and ate their flesh ... Many, driven by hunger, rushed to the grass and tried to pull it out of the ground, kneeling. Then From the "great driving hunt for the Goths," 431 but they were usually too weak, and when their strength had entirely left them, they fell on their own hands and the grass and gave up the ghost. No one buried them, since no one had an interest in burial anymore. And yet no bird made a go at the corpses, which otherwise many birds love as food, because there was nothing to bite at them; for all flesh, as already said, was completely dried up by hunger".¹⁵⁷

Horrific hardship around the same time in Milan as well.

The bishop of the city – according to Procopius, the first in the West by size, population, and wealth, next to Rome – Archbishop Datius, hurried to Rome in the third year of the war, notified Beisaris of an antigothic uprising in all of Liguria, the reclamation of the area for Byzantium, and urged the occupation of Milan. But soon Witigis's nephew Uraias with a strong army, supported by 10,000 Burgundians sent by the Frankish king Theudebert, who, of course, were supposed to explore the situation mainly for themselves. In a short time a terrible famine rages in the city. The inhabitants eat dogs, rats, human corpses. At the end of March 539, the Roman garrison under commander Mun-dilas capitulated and was given free passage. Milan itself, however, writes Prokop, the Goths "razed to the ground; all the men, from the young to the old, they killed, no less than 300,000, the women they made slaves and gave them to the Burgundians as a reward for their confederacy". J. B. Bury calls the massacre of Milan one of the worst in the long series of premeditated barbarities in the annals of mankind – "the career of Attila contains no such hideous act of war". All the churches were also destroyed, by the Arian Goths the Catholic, by the Catholic Burgundians the Arian; a truly progressive ecumenical cooperation – it is called salvation history The tops of the Society, including Prefect Reparatus, brother of the Pope, are chopped up into dog food. Archbishop Datius himself, however, the real perpetrator of the inferno, had left in time.¹⁵⁸

No sooner were the Burgundians back, heavily laden with booty, than Theudebert himself invaded Liguria at the head of an army before the spring of 539.

Justinian had called the Franks already at the beginning of the conflict, according to the Catholic Daniel-Rops still in the 20th century, to "the great drive hunt for the Goths". The Merovingians, Chil-debert I, Chlotar I, their nephew Theudebert, also promised the emperor their assistance, also took his money, but also took 2000 pounds of gold from the Goths – and Provence from both; formally (ceded) by Justinian, factually by Witigis. In 537 Theudebert sent him an army of Alemanni, in 538 an army of Burgundians and helped him to reconquer the country, Liguria and Upper Italy north of the Po. But when the Goths seemed to become too strong for him, in the spring of 539, with allegedly 100,000 Franks from southern Gaul, he stabbed them in the back, burned Liguria with his troops, the Aemilia,

and on crossing the Po, writes Prokop, "they slaughtered the Gothic children and women they could get hold of and threw their corpses into the river as the first fruits of the war". Head over heels, the Gothic warriors fled towards Ravenna and ran into the sabers of the Romans. However, famine and pestilence also wore down Theudebert's army to such an extent that he lost a large part of it and had to evacuate Italy again.¹⁵

In May 540, Ravenna, devastated by water and land, fell at the hands of a traitor. He had set fire to the city's granaries on Beiisar's orders, so Witigis surrenders. Together with Mataswintha and the widow of the Thuringian prince, Amalaberga (who fled to the Goths in 535), along with their children and the entire crown treasure, he migrates to Constantinople. There Justinian granted the abdicated king the rank of patrician. Many other Goths, however, were burned out on the Persian front, just like the rest of the Vandals. Since Witigis' nephew Uraias, the destroyer of Milan, had renounced the crown in favor of Ildibald

from the "great hunt for the Goths,"⁴³³ the latter becomes king. He has Uraias murdered, then dies himself by assassin's hand, and his successor, Rugian king Eraric, also ends up like this after highly treacherous negotiations with Justinian and is replaced by the Gothic city commander of Treviso, Totila, who had made Eraric's death a condition for his rule.¹⁶⁰

Now the war began to drag on, especially since Eastern Rome was also tied up on the Persian front. Again and again Justinian and Byzantium, an old Roman and Christian tradition (I 287 ff), fought against the Sassanids, 530 to 532, 539 to 562; later still 572 to 591 and 604 to 628. If at all possible, the Persian Christians supported Ostrom in this. Thus, in 551, they encouraged or even orchestrated a palace revolution against Great King Chusrö I (531–579). The Great King, a liberator of the peasants from their bondage, had fallen out with his eldest son Anöszäd, who is said to have been more active in his father's harem than in the army. And when Chusrö was pronounced dead in a serious illness and a revolt broke out, the Persian Christians, under the Catholicos Mar Aba, rallied behind Anöszäd, since his mother, one of the king's consorts, had won him over to Christianity. But after the south of the country had temporarily become hell with smoking castles, uncounted ordeals and murders, the rebellion collapsed.¹⁶¹

The war with the Persians, however, continued, and that with the

Goths likewise. They had never wanted it. They had wished to be allowed to live in the country and serve the emperor in return. They wished this further. In continued amicable settlement attempts it finds expression again and again during the long slaughter. It also corresponds to a certain Gothic tradition, a last instruction of Theoderic: to honor the king, to love the Romans and to seek, next to God's grace, above all that of the emperor. But all Gothic offers of peace and submission to Justinian were rejected. The abominations grew ever greater, those of the Catholic Byzantines, those of the Arian Goths.¹⁶²

434 Justinian 1.

And once again these got the upper hand. Once again they conquer, mainly with cavalry troops, almost all of Italy, including Sardinia, Corsica, Sicily. In many years of struggle Totila (541–552), according to Prokop a man of the sharpest mind and extraordinary energy, took from Pavia fortress after fortress, city after city. Benevento falls, Naples falls. Even Rome, where all the Arian priests were expelled, where there was again a terrible famine, even Rome he got hold of twice, in 546 and 550. He tears down the walls of all the conquered places, so that no enemy will be able to settle in them, so that the citizens will be freed forever from the torments of the siege. After the fall of the city in 546, the Romans also confessed that he had lived with them like a father with his children. Even the Byzantines, who had been deprived of their wages, ran to him, and even more so the tenant farmers who had been chased away, the half-starved slaves. In return, however, he is met by the hatred of the landowners. And the

Catholic Church. As before in Africa against the Vandals, it now stirs up the atrocity propaganda against the Goths. And it pulls all the more together with the landowners, because it is itself the largest landowner. Thus, she is by no means acting as an advocate of the slaves, as she would have us believe again and again. She is the fellow campaigner of the slave owners. She represents them! It is therefore anything but astonishing that Pope Vigilius, through his representative and successor Pelagius, seeks the return of the runaway slaves fighting in the Gothic army. Totila assured Pelagius of his greatest goodwill, but did not want to talk about three things: "the Sicilians, Rome's walls and the defected slaves". He rejected negotiations about their return from the outset. After all, he had incorporated them into the army with the promise never to hand them over to their masters again. "It is hard to imagine what else would have attracted the slaves to the Gothic troops, if not the freedom they longed for" (Rothenhöfer).¹⁶³

It is clear that the Catholic Church of Italy, that especially the high clergy in the Gothic War—as the Catholic clergy.

From the "great drive hunt for the Goths" ⁴³⁵

of Africa in the War of the Vandals – was not on the side of the "heretics" and "barbarians". And if this is already true of the "Gothic" pope, the son of Hormis, Silverius, on whose "advice", according to the Catholic "Handbook of Church History", the Romans had "surrendered their city to the Byzantine general Beisaris without a fight", it is certainly even more true of the "Byzantine" pope Vigilius, his murderer. Vigilius spent most of his pontificate in Constantinople. He was a creature of the Empress, to whom he owed his papacy. And to the emperor he served as a go-between in the Gothic War with the Franks, with whom Justinian engaged in antigovernment alliance negotiations to encircle and destroy the Goth king Totila (who, for his part, was just sparing the Catholic churches of Rome and their possessions). Bishop Auxanius of Arles was ordered by Pope Vigilius to pray for Justinian, Theodora and Beisaris on May 545. The successor of Auxanius, Aurelian, he obliged on 23. August 546 "to preserve with episcopal zeal at all times between the most gracious sovereigns (Justinian I and Theodora) and the glorious king Childebert the bonds of intact friendship". It is understandable that little is known about this network of relationships. Caspar comments, "One glimpses here the game of diplomatic alliance negotiations between Byzantium and the new Frankish power to ensnare the last successful Goth king Totila, negotiations in which Beisaris and the pope acted as intermediaries." ¹⁶⁴

In 548, Pope Vigilius even "achieved unique historical significance" (Giesecke).

Beisaris, defeated in Italy by Totila, had returned to Constantinople, the emperor already almost without hope of victory. At this moment, Prokop reports, "the archbishop of Rome" and other noble refugees from Italy "implored the emperor to snatch their homeland from the Goths again". He urged the regent again and again to continue the war vigorously. After a long period of wavering, Justinian appointed his emperor, whom he jealously disliked.

⁴³⁶ Justinian I.

After the latter's sudden death in 552, he appointed the Armenian eunuch Narses. With a strong army and supported by elite Germanic troops, Narses stabbed the rest of the Goths, succeeding all the better because he was "under the special protection of the virgin Mother of God," who "watched over all his actions" and served him virtually "as a strategic advisor" (Euagrios).¹⁶⁵

This assistance of the chaste, the most sweet Mother of God Mary was enjoyed by many Christian great butchers in the course of history. Emperor Justinian himself also attributed his bloody victories over the Vandals and Goths, who had been deposed from the historical scene, to Mary. His nephew Justin II made her the patroness in the war against the Persians. The monster Clovis attributed his brutal triumphs to Mary. Charles Martell, Charlemagne, mighty battle-waging Spanish kings, the bloodhound Cortez, who filled the New World with millions of corpses and millions of misfortunes, Tilly, who

fought his thirty-two victories "under the sign of Our Lady of Altötting", until he was defeated by the "heretic" Gustav Adolf at the thirty-third time and bit the dust himself – they and uncounted others were as great devotees of Mary as bloodhounds (what an insult for dogs) equal to Beiisar (who, after all, did not pray a rosary in front of it like, for instance, among many others, the noble knight Prince Eugene, who always carried the rosary next to the sword – because that belongs together! And whenever the soldiers saw him fiddling particularly long and intimately with the rosary, they said, "Now there'll soon be another battle, the old man prays so much").¹⁶⁶

As against the Vandals, Catholica sided with the emperor against the Ostrogoths. And as she had once incited him to war against the North Africa of the "heretics," so now she urged him to continue the war against the Goths. Totila, who seemed to foresee his fate, who repeatedly offered peace to Byzantium, is soon attacked all around. First, through General Artabanos, he loses Sicily in the winter of 551. Then, at Sini-gaglia, the Gothic fleet is destroyed. And now appears in the Nor-

Of the "great drive against the Goths, "437 Narses, the eunuch, equally adept as soldier and diplomat, Beiisar's rival, Theodora's favorite, a cool, serpentine smooth man, a pious one too, who attributes all his victories, at least Pfaffheit boasts, to him, to prayer and who now, already more than 65 years old, with enough butchers, admittedly, becomes the "conqueror and destroyer of the entire Gothic people" and "gains an enormous wealth in gold, silver and other precious things" (Paulus Diaconus). In 552, in the decisive battle at Busta Gallorum or at Taginae on the Via Flaminia, north of Spoleto, he completely rounds up the Gothic army, also by 5500 Lombards and 3000 Heruls. Totila falls in flight. His bloody head is waved around by the victors on a lance. And in October 553, after sixty days of desperate struggle, the last Goth king Teja and his army core fall at the foot of Vesuvius. Narses liquidated a considerable number of other Franks and Alemanni under the Alemanni duke Bucelin, who wanted to use the Gothic debacle in his own way and have Italy for himself with his brother Leuthari, in a murderous battle at Volturmo near Capua in 554. They were cut down like cattle. The rest is said to have sunk in the floods of the river. "Great was the joy in Italy over this" (tota Italia gaudens), exults the Roman Pope's book. A similarly strong army under Bucelin's brother Leuthari, already on the return march, heavily laden with booty, perished in Venetian from an epidemic. Supposedly only five men out of 70,000 returned. Castrato Narses, received on the steps of St. Peter's by the clergy with hymns, prostrated himself prayerfully at the supposed tomb of the Apostles, and called his dissolute Soldadeska to piety and continued exercise of arms. A last Gothic fort in the Apennines resisted until 555, and in the north Verona and Brescia (with Merovingian help) were not even won until 562. An imperial governor, the Exarch, now resided in Ravenna. The Ostrogoths also disappear from history.¹⁶⁷

In the closing stages of their extinction, Justinian used a dispute over the throne in the Arian Visigoth Empire in 552 to further-

438 Justinian 1st invasion under the militarily inexperienced patricius Liberius, already more than eighty years old. In Spain, where the powerful and wealthy Catholic bishops were reluctant to submit to the Arian "heretics," the Gothic noble Athanagild had risen up against King Agila. And now, as in Africa, in Italy, the Catholics welcomed the intervention of the Catholic ruler, beginning a more than seventy-year war between Byzantium and the Visigoths. However, Justinian no longer succeeded in total annihilation here. But his weak force was able to conquer the Balearic Islands as well as the most important port cities and fortresses in the southeast of the country.¹⁶⁸

The

great beneficiary of the inferno:

THE ROMAN CLRUKE.

The twenty-year Gothic War turned Italy into a smoking ruin, a desert. According to L. M. Hartmann, perhaps still the best German expert on the period, it inflicted wounds worse than those inflicted on

Germany by the Thirty Years' War. The bloodshed probably numbered in the millions. Whole regions were deserted, almost all cities were besieged once or repeatedly, sometimes all inhabitants were killed, the women and children were often dragged away as slaves by the Byzantines, the men, on both sides, were massacred as enemies and "heretics". Rome, the city of millions, conquered five times, devastated five times, ravaged by sword, famine and plague, had only 40,000 inhabitants. The large cities of Milan and Naples were depopulated.

With the depopulation, however, a tremendous impoverishment spread, above all through the desolation of the fields, but also through the widespread stagnation of the herds. The broken water pipes, the thermal baths decayed, irreplaceable works of art and culture perished. Everywhere corpses and debris, epidemics

The great beneficiary of the inferno: the Roman Church 439

and hunger. Hundreds of thousands perished. In the Pice-nian alone, writes Prokop, who emphasizes his eyewitnessship, only anno 539 about 50,000 people are said to have starved to death and then to have been so withered that even the vultures spurned them.^{16'}

But the emperor's "good hope" had been fulfilled, "that God would graciously grant us to acquire again what the ancient Romans possessed as far as the borders of both oceans, but lost through subsequent negligence." Justinian was able to attach to himself in 534 the splendid epithets "victor over the Vandals, victor over the Goths, etc."¹⁷⁰

And so on ...

Even Jesuit Hartmann Grisar admits, "what the Byzantines brought in place of the Gothic regiment was not freedom, but the reverse of it ... amounted to subjugation of free movement of personality, to a system of servitude," while "among the Goths true freedom had a home."¹⁷¹

Winners, as usual after wars (and in peace, of course), were only the rich. The so-called Sanctio pragmatica of 554 restored the "old order," the "western half of the empire" with the exarch's supreme command in Ravenna. All social measures of Totila were abolished, the rights of the great agrarians were partially extended, they themselves were favored in every way, the devastated country was still sucked to the last and with relentless brutality high taxes were squeezed out of the already miserably starving people. All runaway or taken away slaves and colonists had to return to their masters.¹⁷¹

Probably the church gained the most from the fiasco, however, as is usually the case after wars - still and especially in the 20th century. ("One has come to the conclusion," confessed Cardinal Gasquet at the Catholic Congress in Liverpool after World War I, "that the man who came out of the war best was the pope!"¹⁷³

In Italy and Africa, the Arian "heresy" had been eradicated from 440 Justinian 1.

erased. The independent kingdom of Italy had also disappeared, and in the general chaos, as the most grandiose parasite, a kind of "church state" was growing. The former prerogatives of Rome were restored, the power and prestige of the Roman bishop increased by Justinian. In the Old Kingdom, too, his ecclesiastical legislation increasingly favored the Catholic Church, especially monasticism. And while "heretics" were persecuted ever more harshly, the pope ruled over a patriarchate that reached deep into the East. Yes, he got an increased municipal power, a far-reaching control over administration and officialdom; as also the bishops, besides and before the Notabein (primary), got a say in the election of provincial governors and in general the privileges of the eastern clergy, through the Pragmatic Sanction, now also benefited the Italian as valid law. Outstandingly organized, the latter was able to defend its material interests earlier than any private person after the end of the Inferno. With the Senate, the Pope also received supervision over coinage, weights and measures. And since the assets of the church were much more mobile than any lay assets, since it could not only maintain but even increase its great

possessions, especially through the robbery of the considerable Arian church properties, it became "an economic power of the first rank and the only institution of public life which was on the rise in the general decline of Italy" (Caspar), it became "almost the only money power in Italy" (Hartmann) "and the pope the richest man in the land" (Haller).¹⁷⁴

Now, however, the Western Church profited not only through changes in its possessions and increases in its assets, which interested the emperor personally; but now, as after every great war, the houses of prayer, and at that time especially the monasteries, filled up. (As still after the First World War, where the clergy in Germany founded an average of twelve to thirteen monasteries per month from 1919 to 1930; with a total increase in membership of about 2000 members per year!) For the bankrupt peasant, the starving colonist, the tax overburdened

The great profiteer of the inferno: the Roman Church 441

dered municipal official, they all came. "The Church," writes Gregorovius, "now stood alone in the midst of the rubble of the old state, alone upright, alone vigorous, and conscious of a goal, for around it was desert." The tendency of the time, Hartmann also confirms, "was everywhere to increase the spiritual fortune The mood of the time, the general decline and the terrible misfortune of the twenty-year war was favorable to the faith that foresaw the near end of the world, that made material goods seem stale and transient, and demanded introspection in order to still save the soul.... These tendencies corresponded just then in Italy with the flourishing of the monastic system ... But it is again the colonists who maintain the monastery through their taxes and interest ... the largest part of the yield of this fertility still comes not to them, but to their landlord, the monastery".¹

A particular war profiteer was the Ravenna church, whose regular income was already estimated at the time at 12,000 sol. (gold pieces). Its land holdings, which extended as far as Sicily, were constantly increased by donations and inheritances, and wealthy bankers built and furnished so-called houses of worship. Above all, however, the bishop of Ravenna cashed in on the Arian churches and ecclesiastical estates, which were naturally most dense in the vicinity of the former Gothic capital.¹⁷⁶

In a private law amendment of his twelfth year of reign (538/39), Justinian wrote: "All our zeal went to see that liberties prevail, are strong, flourish, and increase in our state. And because of this desire we have undertaken such great wars against Libya and the West for the <right believer in God and for the freedom of our subjects. "¹⁷⁷

But if the emperor had not waged his more than twenty years of wars for the "freedom of his subjects," he had certainly waged them for the "right believer. On the altar of which, it is certain, he had slaughtered two peoples and extinguished them.

44i Justinian I.

martyred. For the recuperatio imperii, so admired by many contemporaries and especially by Justinian himself, consisted above all in the bloody reconquest of North Africa and Italy for Catholicism. The despot thus became the "champion of the Roman Church," giving "first and foremost to Rome and the pope whatever he could give" (Rubin).¹⁷⁸

To his subjects, on the other hand, the emperor gave nothing, nothing good anyway. For whoever gives to Rome and the pope in such a way, takes it from others. And almost always he then oppresses others. Especially the long wars, supposedly fought for the freedom of the people of North Africa, Spain, but especially Italy, had - besides the Persian wars, 700 newly built fortresses and hundreds of newly built churches - swallowed up enormous sums. But in order to be able to finance the armies in the East and West, the Eastern provinces were ruined by enormous taxes, the people, as Prokop emphasizes, were sucked dry more and more ruthlessly, more and more dissatisfied, especially since the administration was just as corrupt as the judiciary, the generals were insolent, extortion, bending of the law and violence were commonplace, and in this great police and sacral state everything was stolen, from the policeman

to the minister, the so-called "robber hunters" sometimes hid worse than the robbers themselves. While the great agrarians, generals and "orthodox" church princes were doing brilliantly, there were half a dozen major popular uprisings in Justinian's capital alone in the last decade of his reign. And the Catholic despot, who pressed especially hard by his laws even the colonists, smothered in blood all the revolutionary uprisings of the people.¹⁷

Continuing, the chronicler of the epoch, Prokop, the model of Byzantine historiography, in his "Secret History" accuses the emperor of the murder and robbery of his subjects, as well as the most unscrupulous squandering of the extorted funds. Prokop's accusations culminate in the 18th chapter, which may well hit the nail on the head, notwithstanding some exaggerations, especially of the numbers or when he writes that one could count "all the sand faster than the battle victims of this

The great profiteer of the inferno: the Roman Church 443

Emperor ... Libya, which is so vast, he ruined in such a way that even during a longer wandering one rarely has the surprise to meet a human being. And if there were 80,000 weapon-bearing Vandals there initially, who could estimate the number of their women, children and servants? How could anyone estimate the quantity of all the

(Roman) Libyans who used to live in the cities, cultivating crops or seafaring and fishing, as I myself observed for the most part with my own eyes? Even more numerous were the Maurusians, who all perished with women and children. And finally, the earth held many Roman soldiers and their companions from Byzantium. So that someone who would state five million dead for Africa would only just satisfy the facts. The reason for this was that Justinian, immediately after the defeat of the Vandals, did not take care of the fortification of the rule over the country. He did not take care of the security of the booty by loyalty of the subjects. Rather, he immediately, without hesitation, ordered Beiisar back under the unlawful accusation of tyranny, and from then on he could do as he pleased and plunder the whole of Libya.

He immediately sent tax officials (censitores) and levied extremely cruel and novel taxes. He confiscated the best goods and prevented the Arians from taking their sacraments. He paid the soldiers' wages only by default, and in other respects, too, he imposed heavy burdens on them. The uprisings grew out of this and eventually led to great destruction. He could not remain in the existing; it was just his way to upset and stir up everything.

Italy, which is no less than three times the size of (the province of!) Africa, became far more deserted than this on all sides, so that the revelation of the number of those who perished there too will be obvious. The reason for what happened in Italy, I have already reported above (in the history of the war). Everything that he had sinned in Libya, he also did here. And he also sent the so-called logothets (special agents of the minister of finance), revolutionized and

Justinian I.

spoiled everything on the spot. The Gothic dominion, before this war, extended from the Gallic country to the borders of Dacia, where the city of Sirmium is located. Much land of Gaul and Venetia was taken by the Teutons (Franks!) when the Roman army came to Italy. Sirmium, however, and its surroundings possessed the Gepids, but all, in short, completely deserted. For some were carried off by war, others were destroyed by disease and hunger, which tend to follow war. Illyria and all Thrace, from about the Ionian sea to the suburbs of Byzantium, so also Hellas and the land of the Cherso-nesians, were overrun by Huns, slaves and Antens almost every year since Justinian had taken over, and did the most terrible things to the inhabitants. For I believe more than 200,000 of the Romans there have been killed and enslaved in each invasion, so that the whole country is truly a Scythian wasteland. Such, then, were the consequences of war in Africa and Europe. But the Saracens, during all this time, incessantly overran and destroyed the Romans of the East from Egypt to the Persian frontier, so that all the regions became

extremely destitute of human beings, and, I believe, no one who asks the number of persons who perished in this way will be able to find them. The Persians and Chusra invaded the rest of the Roman territory four times. They destroyed the cities, and of the people they seized in the conquered cities and every stretch of land, they killed some and dragged the others away with them, thus depriving the area just invaded by them of its inhabitants. Since they also invaded the Colchian land (Lazika!), they themselves, the Lazians and Romans, are destroyed to this day. But also the Persians, Saracens, Huns or the slave tribe or the other barbarians did not leave the Roman territory unharmed. They were affected by the invasions and even more by the sieges and the many warlike clashes, they also perished along with them. Not the Romans alone, but also almost all the barbarians bore the reward of Justinian murder.

Also

The great beneficiary of the inferno: the Roman church 445

Chusrö himself, after all, possessed a bad character, but as I have said in the relevant books (of the history of war), Justinian granted him every inducement to war. He did not think of acting at the right time, but did everything at the wrong moment. In peace and treaties he always concocted causes for war against the neighbors out of a devious mind, but in war he slackened for no reason, carried out everything necessary very casually as a result of his avarice, and instead of taking care of this, searched the clouds and busily endeavored to investigate the nature of God. However, as a wicked murderer, he also did not give up war and again could not defeat the enemies because he never did what was necessary thanks to his short-sighted pettiness. Thus, during his reign, the whole world was sufficiently filled with the human blood of almost all Romans and barbarians.

To summarize, this is what happened around this time in all the Roman lands in the form of war events. But if I calculate the amount of riots that took place in Byzantium and in every city, I do not think that there was less murder than in the war. Justice and uniform punishment of crimes were almost non-existent, but since the emperor adhered to one of the parties with the greatest zeal, the opposite side did not keep quiet either. On the contrary, some of them, because of their inferiority, and others, because of their wantonness, were constantly inclined to despair and madness. Sometimes they went at each other in bright heaps, sometimes they fought in groups of a few or set the ambushes individually, as the case might be. For thirty-two years they did not rest for a moment, they committed terrible acts against each other and were mostly killed by the authority presiding over the demos (praefectus urbi). But the punishment almost regularly hit the Greens. Furthermore, the persecution of the Samaritans and the so-called heretics filled the Roman Empire with murder. This, however, is only summarily mentioned by me now, since I have dealt with it shortly before. "180

44^Justinian I.

When the tyrant died, the people were not free - and the empire was run down, almost bankrupt. In contrast, the era of Justinian proved to be extremely advantageous for the papacy -alone through the reclamation of North Africa, the destruction of two powerful Arian peoples, the dissolution of the independent kingdom in Italy- materially and legally, even though the popes themselves now again came more strongly under the sphere of influence of the regent, their own power was considerably reduced, and many a one of them was dangerously humiliated. At the same time, however, the emperor subjected the Oriental bishops to the pope, assuring them: "in all things we are concerned that the honor and authority of your see grow". But Caspar comments: "Never before had an emperor spoken so reverently to the Roman Church, but never at the same time had he acted so high-handedly".181 West-Eastern smears or murderer Pope Vigilius (537-555).

The pope under whom the Gothic War began was Agapet I (535-536). On behalf of the Goths, Agapet, pretending to have no money for travel expenses, traveled to Byzantium in 536, where he was supposed to stop the war of aggression that had already begun. But he achieved nothing for the Goths and

probably did not want to achieve anything – according to Gregorovius, "he seems to have oriented his mission as an enemy of the Goths." The *Liber Pontificalis* reports: "Agapet traveled to Constantinople and was received there with splendor. Immediately he began a dispute about the faith with the most pious emperor and Augustus Justinian ..., and it turned out, with God's help, that the bishop of Constantinople, Anthimus, was a false teacher." In any case, the subject must have interested the Roman more than a peace with the Goths! He also succeeded in dismissing the monophysite patriarch Anthimus, who was supported by the empress.

West-Eastern smear pieces 447

about it a completely falsified report in the *Liber Pontificalis* – and to consecrate the new orthodox patriarch Menas on March 13, 536: "his activity there was a single victory" (H. Rahner SJ). But from the Gothic point of view: a politically completely failed visit! Then, however, Agapet died on April 22nd 536 of a sudden and until today mysterious death in Constantinople. On September 17, his body was brought to Rome in a sealed lead coffin and was buried in St. Peter's Basilica. Even Erich Caspar, who is usually very reserved in his judgments, involuntarily wonders whether everything was done right in the Pope's sudden death. For "if Theodora wanted to get rid of the inconvenient man, she certainly knew ways and means to accomplish it completely silently". The Roman chargé d'affaires at the court of the empress, Vigilius, probably had the best chance of succeeding him. Already in 532 he almost ascended to the coveted chair. And the empress was very interested in him. But even now he did not get his chance, because he was preceded by the subdeacon Silverius (536–537), a son of Pope Hormisdas.¹⁸²

The emperor forbade Anthimus, who had been dethroned "in accordance with the sentiments of the most holy pope," to stay in Byzantium, its surroundings, and other major cities. Theodora, however, kept the deposed man in secret chambers of her palace until the end of her life and finally, after some scandalously overcome difficulties, brought her candidate Vigilius to the Roman chair (p. 427).

Vigilius (537–555), the murderer of his predecessor, but perhaps also implicated in the abrupt death of Pope Agapet, was the pope during the great Gothic slaughter. Thanks to his un-generous agility, he stayed in the "Holy See" for eighteen years, not being very strict with the faith, but even more so with the wishes of the sovereign.

This bondage of the clergy had existed in the East since Constantine. For already he, the first Christian regent, was lord of empire and church. Already under him, emperorship and catholicism belonged together, or were supposed to belong together. And

448 Justinian 1 through Constantine and his successors, the traditional "state-friendliness" of the clergy led to the actual "Caesaropapism" in the 5th century. The bishops carried out whatever the dictator commanded. Hundred by hundred they signed, docile as automatons, even in matters of faith the decrees of the emperors Basiliskos (476), Zenon (482), Justinian (532), no matter how much this contradicted the general church teachings.

Of the Eastern clergy, the Italian wrote in 552: "They are Greeks, the bishops, have rich and magnificent churches, and would not endure to be suspended even two months from the government of their benefices. To prevent this, they do everything without hesitation at any time according to the will of the princes, whatever is required of them." Occasionally, however, a pope, such as John II, who, under imperial pressure, condemned the Acoimites loyal to Rome and recognized the Monophysite-friendly Theopaschite formula (p. 387); or just now Pope Vigilius, who in the so-called Dreikapiteledikt condemned the teachings of the "orthodox" theologians Theodore of Mopsuestia (the teacher of Nestorios attacked by Cyril of Alexandria), Theodoret of Cyrus, and Ibas of Edessa (both hostile to Cyril, but rehabilitated at Chalcedon) at Justinian's request, then recanted, but later rejected them again.¹⁸³

At first, however, he confessed his faith, admittedly breaking his promises. Contrary to his assurances, he

in no way favored the Monophysite aspirations of Theodora. Rather he took "from the first moment on a quite dignified attitude towards the imperial court" (H. Rahner SJ) – if one disregards the fact that he had already taken his money, after all 700 gold pieces. But then he submitted to the emperor in a further theologian quarrel, the so-called Three Chapters Controversy, which stirred up first the Orient and then also the Occident. The latter had – in order to win over the Monophysites authoritative in the southeast of the empire, without surrendering the Chalcedonense – by an edict (in reality a – lost-
West-Eastern smear pieces 449

ner – treatise written around 544) the three theologians and bishops of the 5th century Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrus and Ibas of Edessa, a rather unknown man, who had long since died at peace with the Church, subsequently condemned, completely autocratic, without consulting a synod. The Oriental chief shepherds, wholly dependent on the emperor, generally accepted the condemnation, sometimes after some reluctance, but the Western ones, who continued to serve, did not. The African episcopate, for example, was united against Pope Vigilius in the three-chapter controversy, while the Italian and Gallic episcopates were united for the most part.^{18*}

To change the minds of the recalcitrants, Justinian, probably influenced by Theodora, summarily had the pope dragged out of the middle of a service in the church of St. Cecilia on November 22, 545, while he was distributing communion to the people (*munera erogantem*), and amidst the storms of the Goths around Rome, which fell in December, onto a ship and set course for Constantinople. (According to the Pope's book, the Augusta had sent the scribo Anthimus with a strong crew and the order: "Only in the basilica of St. Peter spare him; but if you find Vigilius in the Lateran or in the palatium or in any church, get him on a ship immediately and bring him as far as us. Otherwise I will have you flayed alive.") The pious Roman community had first received the blessing of Vigilius, but then, writes even the Pope's book, threw stones, beating, cooking pots after him and wished him to the devil. "Your hunger go with you, your death go with you! Evil you have done to the Romans, evil you shall find wherever you go!"¹⁸⁵

Vigilius, who was not to see the city alive again, recovered, with imperial permission of course, for almost a year in sunny Sicily (Catania), where the church had huge possessions, while Totila took Rome in December 546, had the city walls largely dragged down, the population expelled, the senators dragged along as hostages and later executed. Only on 25.

450 Justinian I.

January 547 Vigilius, brilliantly received, arrived in Constantinople. Emperor and Pope kissed each other's cheeks in tears, perhaps not only of joy because of the news of Rome's fall, which had arrived shortly before. Then Vigilius manfully excommunicated all signatories of the Three Chapters Edict – Pope Gregory "the Great" later even claimed a banishment of the Empress: extremely implausible! And in the following year Vigilius himself, in the so-called *Judicatum* of n. April 548, he agreed to the condemnation of the Three Chapters. Yes, he also forced the Latin bishops (from Milan and Africa) who were in Constantinople to sign it. A magnificent demonstration of papal doctrinal primacy! In the West, especially in Africa, a storm of indignation arose. But also the immediate environment of the pope protested in such a way that he deposed and excommunicated some of the deacons closest to him, among them Rusticus, his own nephew (he went into hiding with the *Akoimets*), before a synod of African bishops excommunicated him, the pope, himself. But when now almost the whole Occident cried out, also the Roman clergy rebelled against him, Gaul, Upper Italy, Dalmatia, Illyria broke away from him – until the end of the 7th century the last twitches of the schism of the Tricapitular Affair continued to work in the West, especially in Upper Italy –, he, supported especially by the deacon Pelagius, his successor, who had returned to Constantinople, emasculated himself and withdrew his sentence. Vigilius now protested against another three-chapter edict of the emperor (July 551) and

threatened all signatories with excommunication. But after the emperor had made the obstinate African episcopate compliant by exile and bribery (the bishop Victor of Tunnuna, Africa, after years of banishment also locked up in various monasteries of Constantinople, where he wrote a boring "World Chronicle"), finally also conquered Italy, Vigilius, who had also been harassed again, believed his chair was probably not unjustly endangered and fell down again. He did everything demanded by the most Christian of emperors, who admittedly spared nothing: promises, feints, broken oaths, poli
West-Eastern Smear Pieces 451

force of evidence. On December 8, 553, in a letter to the Patriarch of Constantinople, Eutychios (552-565), the pope confessed his "error" and rejected the "Three Chapters" together with their defenders. Justinian, however, was not satisfied with the papal private letter. He demanded more, a detailed and public condemnation, and got it too. In the Constitutum (II) of February 23, 554, Vigilius again condemned the Three Chapters. By doing so, he secured his return home the next spring, but died on the way, in early June 555, at Syracuse in Sicily, returning to Rome only as a corpse - the first pope, since Peter, not to be canonized.*86

Vigilius himself communicated his sufferings, his "martyrdom" in the clutches of the Catholic emperor, "His Pious Majesty," as he himself writes, to the whole world, or, nevertheless, to the "people of God on the face of the earth" (universo populo Dei) in an encyclical of his own, dated February 5, 552, "in the 25th year of the reign of the Lord Justinianus, the everlasting Augustus." His Holiness laments here eloquently about the "embarrassing drudgeries", about "the torments (multa mala intolerabilia) to which we were subjected without ceasing", which became "more and more unbearable". All his "oral and written protests did not help, on the contrary, every day our suffering increased". And now Pope Vigilius describes the peak of his misery: "Two days before Christmas we could personally observe and hear the noise with our own ears (auribus nostris), how all the gates of the palace", the emergency accommodation of the confessor, "were covered with guards..., their wild shouting penetrated into the bedchamber in which we were resting; still in the night in which we escaped, we heard it.... The reason and magnitude of the highest danger, which we despised under the pressure of fear, can be judged from this: We had to squeeze through the narrow gap of a wall that was under construction, and then stood in the pitch darkness, as if bound by terrible pain. From this one can clearly see the hardship we are currently in purely for the sake of the Church, and which

452-Justinian I.

Imprisonment compelled us to flee at this moment of supreme peril. "187

The martyr pope, who after all was also a murderer pope, but who himself, "greatness of the highest danger", had to squeeze through the "narrow gap" of a wall and then stood in pitch darkness, expressly wishes that about such misery "not a single person of the faith of Christ remain in ignorance". And at the end of his collected lamentations, as usual, he hums before the emperor: "Nothing is higher to me, not bonds of love and bonds of blood nor whatever goods of the earth, than my conscience and my good reputation with His pious majesty" (piissimi principis).188

Jesuit Hugo Rahner calls this "the great encyclical of February 5, 552, to the whole Catholic world," and asserts of Vigilius, "In the sufferings of the papacy, all the wretchedness of former years has fallen from him . , "18'

Many things can be subsumed under the term wretchedness in Vigilius, from high-grade intrigue to greed for money, venality, denial of the faith, and even murder, papal murder, mind you. And may he not have been involved in any way in the mysterious death of Agapet I, so very likely this does not seem, in the death of Silverius the matter is all the clearer. And as Apocrisiar Vigilius, between these two deaths, hastened

from Constantinople to Rome, to become there, by the advice of the Empress Theodora, so well-disposed to him, Pope, "Vicar of Christ", so now Apocrisiar Pelagius, after the death of Vigilius, hastened from Constantinople to Rome, to become there, by the order of the Emperor Justinian, so well-disposed to him, Pope, "Vicar of Christ". Each time a pope had died in Constantinople or coming from Constantinople - and the successor, also coming from Constantinople, was already on his way. Certainly, Vigilius had not ascended the "Holy See" at the first attempt, and certainly he had not fallen asleep in Constantinople, like Agapet, but only on the journey from there in Syracuse. But could not at least the scene of the crime have been changed

to make the duplicity of the things not too clear? Vigilius, at any rate, faded away as surprisingly in Syracuse as Agapet once did in Constantinople. And when Pelagius came to Rome to take the "Holy See" in the highest, that is, in imperial commission, a large part of the clergy and the nobility refused, because Pelagius was considered complicit in the sudden death of Vigilius - so much so that he had to take an oath of government before all the people, with the Gospel in his hand, the cross of Christ on his head - and at his side Narses, the protector from Byzantium!¹⁹⁰

And then Pelagius wrote a defense, not of his dead predecessor, no, but of the Three Chapters, in which he reproached Pope Vigilius most vehemently, since his "fickleness and venality had incited the enemies of the Council of Chalcedon to endless scandals and to the abuse of His Imperial Majesty's zeal for the faith".¹⁹¹

What perhaps stemmed least from His Imperial Majesty's zeal for the faith - the "heresy" laws aside - was probably the most enduring: the codification of Roman law that continued into modern times: the Codex Justinianus (529) and the even more important collection of Digesta (533) under the direction of the quaestor sacri palatii, the imperial confidant and minister of justice Tribonian. As with Constantine (I 263 ff), one naturally likes to praise the more humane conception of law through the influence of Christianity. But if, for example, the slavelessness is mitigated, it is mainly because in the production process, especially in agriculture, it is no longer the slave who plays the essential role, but the colonist. But it is precisely towards the latter that Justinian's law proves to be completely ruthless. And how humane is a law at all that denies all legal protection to all people of other faiths?

The religious zeal of His Imperial Majesty was - like religious zeal of states, churches as a rule - paid for with misery and blood: and, since Justinian's universalistic ambition was hardly less than that of the Constantinian dynasty, with so

454 Justinian I paid in misery and blood than had been the case for a long time. This zeal for faith cost the immense, constantly increasing fleecing of the subjects, because the building mania, the decades-long wars of the despot devoured gigantic sums. The zeal for the faith cost the continued struggle for faith: the suffering of the Monophysites, the persecution of the Manichaeans, the oppression of the Jews, the extermination of the Samaritans, the rigorous fight against paganism, which Justinian hunted down more brutally than any ruler since Theodosios I and whose remnants he practically destroyed. The zeal of faith cost the extermination of the Vandals, the Goths. And it cost his own troops.

Justinian's fight for Catholicism, probably caused more by his offensives in the West than by his convictions, also led to the separatist actions of Egypt and Syria, to the formation of two "heretical" national churches, the Syrian Monophysite, the Coptic Church. And the great wars of aggression in North Africa, in Italy, the triumphant reclamation of the West, part of it, all this was bought by serious losses in the East and North. By constantly increasing tribute payments to the Persians, whose armies raced across the unarmored Orient, who in 540, in the midst of the "eternal peace," burned Antioch to the ground, razed its population or carried it off into slavery, who advanced to the sea, who increasingly and more obviously gained the upper hand in the Near East. But the enormous expansions in the west also denuded the Danube frontier. Constantly new crowds of foreign peoples surged over the Balkans,

especially and since Justinian's first years of rule the Slavs. They flooded the empire as far as the Adriatic, the Gulf of Corinth, and the Aegean Sea. And also flooded it back again, after all, while all other "barbarian" storms were temporary at that time, they occupied the Balkans until today.

But even the Emperor's triumphs in the West were in part short-lived; his restoration of the Empire remained piecemeal. Already from 568 the Lombards conquered large territories

West-East smear pieces 455

Italy. The gains made in Spain's southeast corner are lost again to the Visigoths in a few decades. And finally, the onslaught of the Arabs, of Islam, wipes out Justinian's work from Egypt to North Africa to Spain almost without a trace.